FORUM

Copyright 1946, by The Events Publishing Co.

Vol. CV JUNE, 1946 No. 6

Divorce is a part of the companionship family

Divorce in Our Time

By Paul H. Landis

Dean of the Graduate School, State College of Washington

DIVORCE may be pronounced an evil and attempts made to eliminate it or it may be viewed as a form of social adjustment required in a given family-social system. The first view lends little if anything to an understanding of the basic problem involved in divorce as manifested in contemporary society. Divorce approached from the other standpoint is looked upon as the end product, a device for mediating an unreconcilable conflict, or one that is so viewed by persons involved, a social solution to a bitter form of personal conflict.

More important than statistics on divorce are the attitudes and relationships which lead a high proportion of couples to seek release from a marriage contract which in most cases was entered into with the best intentions, in fact, with hopes for realizing the greatest happiness of which man and woman are capable. To understand divorce one must understand the philosophy of modern marriage, its objectives and goals, its hopes for realization and the standards by which it measures success. The companionship family, which holds compatible associations of husband and wife, parents and children as the criteria of success, has, in our society, been replacing the institutional family which is rooted in the traditions of childbearing, joint economic activity and filial duty. The companionship family prizes romance and its ethereal happiness above all else. It demands the highest level of conjugal friendship.

This is the rigorous test. If the marriage fails to realize this goal, there is no other reason for its continuing, especially if the marriage relation develops intimate forms of tensions and conflicts which day by day association of incompatible temperaments make likely.

The companionship family recognizes no allegiance to the family institution as such. It must either give individuals what they want in marriage or be pronounced a failure. The companionship family is individual-centered rather than child-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centered. Parent-child ties are not primary factors in holding it together. Its stability depends on the hazardous progress of the pattern of romantic happiness between husband and wife.

In this family system youth choose mates with little social supervision. Under the institutional family, adults had much to do with mate selection, in many cases actually arranging the match. The unprecedented responsibility placed upon youth for mate selection at an age when they are immature in judgment, lacking in experience, often lacking in perspective as to what a life-time marriage relationship involves in the way of economic and social responsibility, personal qualities and character, is a major risk in the companionship family system. Youth expect in marriage an enduring bliss of which the emotionally charged romantic involvement of courtship was only a foretaste. Little wonder that few find it.

Marriage, with its rigorous adjustments to personal differences, economic responsibilities, household administration, relatives and community demands, is likely to be an anticlimax; whereas the institutional marriage, founded on practical objectives, often realized unexpected pleasure associated with the duties of family life. Even if it did not, divorce was not used as a solution for problems of family tensions. If children were born and cared for, the marriage was successful even though the couple lacked a close emotional attachment.

The fact that youth evade the claims of kinship and escape from the parental family is another factor in loosening institutional bonds, weakening a sense of continuity between generations and implementing the pleasure motivation of youth to the effect that they may consider their own personal happiness the only thing that matters. Even the removal of the family from the bonds of locality, due to mobility, is an important factor in loosening the bonds of social responsibility that help cement couples together. Mobility separates one from familiar scenes and places, severs common ties and mutual friendships making it seem easy to start life over.

Under such a family-social system petty conflicts and temporary incompatibilities may be exaggerated into major issues. Many a couple has entered into divorce too casually; freedom looked easy, but they often found that the loneliness and isolation which freedom cost was much less satisfying than the marriage which they sacrificed for it. It is significant that in America approximately a third of the divorcees who remarry, remarry their former mate. This would seem to be a confession that many couples entered into divorce too hastily and found the cost of loneliness too great.

The rigorous condemnation of divorce a few generations ago no longer exists. Many states have liberal divorce provisions. One state still clings to the old fashioned requirement—divorce for adultery only—but regardless of state law, the general public, even including religious bodies, is more tolerant of divorce than in previous generations. They are more tolerant because there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is at least a vague understanding of the social forces discussed above, which makes the family of today quite a different institution from that of the past. This in turn gives divorce today a different meaning than it had in our grandparent's time.

There is general recognition that the bonds of love are the only bonds of the modern family; that the ties of common property, of common work, or a family of children, no longer exist for many couples. There is also a general social recognition that the day when a woman was safe only in the bosom of her family has passed. She is often more secure economically and perhaps more emotionally at ease, freed of an unsatisfactory marriage. And there are cases where she may assure to her children a better future alone than within an unsatisfactory and tumultuous marriage. The confession of this fact is made in public policy in that aid to dependent children under the Social Security Act makes no distinction between widowhood by death and widowhood because of divorce, where the welfare of children is involved. Even before that act was passed many states had mothers' pension laws which similarly made no distinction.

The cost of divorce today is not primarily in terms of economic risk or even in terms of public censure but in the emotional sphere.

Divorce is a legal action. Only the law can "put asunder" those whom the church or the law have joined together. Every divorce must, therefore, present to the court a legal cause. From a strictly legal standpoint, the court case is almost always a farce, not only because false reasons are given for the action but because the couple usually agree to the divorce in advance rather than one party bringing action against the other as is true in normal court proceedings.

The usual legal grounds for divorce are about as follows:[1]

Cruelty	47 per cent
Desertion	32 per cent
Adultery	9 per cent
Neglect to Provide	7 per cent
Drunkenness	2 per cent
Other Causes	3 per cent
	100

There are marked variations between the states regarding legal grounds for divorce. The East and South are conservative with regard to permitting divorces and have low divorce rates. The west, acknowledging more grounds for divorce, has higher divorce rates. These high rates are explained in part by the fact that easterners come West to take advantage of the ease of western divorce laws, and also by the fact that residents of the West resort to divorce as a solution to marriage problems more often than those of other regions. The West lacks an established integrated society; community pressures are weaker than in more settled areas where people have lived together for three or four generations. Its people are more mobile; there is less attachment to place. Its people are far removed from the claims of kinship, many having left all relatives behind in

[1] Alfred Cahen, *Statistical Analysis of Divorce*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1932.

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moving West. It is less bothered by the traditional attitudes of the institutional family which persists more tenaciously in the deep South and the rural East.

Ernest R. Mowrer, sociologist at the University of Chicago, has studied broken families to get at the real reasons for divorce and desertion. His studies make it strikingly clear that a great deal of rationalization enters into the court reason for obtaining a divorce. For example, in 295 cases where divorce was granted on the legal ground of desertion, he found that in 40.2 per cent of the cases financial tension was the natural cause for the desertion. In 13.2 per cent of the cases, the party foresook the mate for another. In 10.9 per cent of cases, dissatisfaction with home or married life was the real reason. In 10.5 per cent of the cases, infidelity was the real cause. In other cases, drunkenness, cruelty and irregular habits were found to be the cause.

In the case of 156 divorces granted on legal grounds of cruelty, he found that 45 per cent were in reality brought on by financial tensions; 28.6 per cent by drunkenness; 14.6 per cent by jealousy and infidelity. Divorce for adultery seems to most nearly represent the facts. In 96 cases he found that all but eight per cent had been involved in illicit intercourse.

Of marriages taking place in 1900, only about one in twelve were ultimately terminated by divorce rather than death; of those taking place in 1922, about one in eight. It is assumed that of current marriages at least one in five will eventually terminate in divorce. The ratio will likely be even higher. For war marriages it may be as many as one in three. Clearly the great ideal of all marriages, "until death do us part," is held in less esteem than happiness of marriage partners. When the choice is one of living unhappily together or of divorce, the second alternative is chosen.

To the hazards of divorce is being added the practice of annulment which evades many of the embarrassing and difficult processes of divorce. Leander B. Faber, of the New York Supreme Court, discussing the annulment evil in the *Woman's Home Companion* in September, 1945, indicates that not long ago he heard only one annulment to every fifty divorces, but that he now hears one annulment for every three divorces. Once the annulments were primarily of youngsters under legal marriage age; now an increasing number of annulment suits are brought by people who have been married five to ten years and several of whom are even parents of children. He reports that many are seeking annulments who would have weak grounds for divorce under the law, or who would avoid divorce because their religion forbids it.

The most common grounds for requesting annulment he reports are fraud, duress, usually on the grounds of pressure having been exerted by the girl's family, or on grounds of lack of capacity to understand the nature of marriage. In four out of five cases the action is for fraud, the ground being that the husband or wife had a secret determination never to have children.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This new trend, which opens avenues of escape from marriage for those who, on one pretense or another, have found it unsatisfactory, is another indication of the fundamental weakness of the companionship family. The companionship family cannot and will not be held together by legal requirements. Vows are taken lightly by people in a society which has lost much of the power of moral compulsion and religious authority and in which community pressures can be evaded.

DIVORCE AS A SOCIAL PROCESS

Under the companionship family-social system, divorce is a social process not unlike the process of dating, courtship and engagement. It is those processes in reverse. In stead of a series of experiences building growing intimacy and involvement until the relationship embraces one's entire personality and climaxes in marriage, divorce is a series of experiences beginning with the initial frictions and climaxing in emotional indifference or even violent animosities. Where socity permits a legal escape, it is natural that persons trained to the romantic values of marriage should find no further meaning in marriage.

Tensions in the family may arise over any factors that have meaning in the lives of the husband and wife. It may arise over a problem of orderliness, especially if one person is meticulous and the other is naturally careless. It frequently arises over money, since money has so much meaning to us. It may arise over misunderstandings about sex. The tensions may exist over social relationships, especially if one member likes social activity and the other shuns the crowd. It may arise over such trivial things as the way the mate spends his leisure time, or the kind of recreation he indulges in.

Almost anything in the human relationship may be exaggerated to a place of major importance and become the primary source of tension once it becomes a focus of difference. Many couples cannot analyze fully the source of their tensions. Such tensions, whatever their cause, and whether their cause is recognized by the individuals themselves, are at the basis of the divorce.

Waller has traced the various steps through which the couple goes in approaching divorce. The first stage is a disturbance in the love life of the pair. This eventually leads to the point where friction is so intense that the possibility of divorce is first mentioned.

The next stage is that in which husband or wife tells some outside person or persons of their difficulty. This immediately puts the marriage on a different basis since the couple has lost face with other people. Usually this does not end the marriage; it goes on in a matter-of-fact way, there being discussions as to the proper course of action.

Finally, there comes the stage when the husband and wife definitely decide to make a break. This is followed by a separation which is followed later by the divorce action itself. The divorce does not end the relationship. There is still the important period of mental conflict, during which both individuals find

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves in the midst of problems of reconstructing their lives to fit the new situation.

There is also the problem of emotional re-adjustment. Waller has stated that in his studies of numerous divorce cases, he has yet to find a divorce which was not followed by a serious form of bereavement. In many cases the bereavement following divorce for one or sometimes for both parties is much more serious than bereavement following the death of a mate. Death is always classed among the inevitable occurrences of life. The shock of death may be more sudden but it can be charged to Providence, or to accident, or to natural causes and one can absolve himself of blame. But in case of divorce, there is always the knowledge that it might have been avoided and always the background of expected happiness against which to project it.

The extent of the re-adjustments depends on temperament of parties involved and on the nature of new relationships established. Contrary to popular opinion, the majority of divorces are not motivated by a desire for freedom to remarry. Less than a third of women and less than one-half of men eventually remarry. Some find the new marriage unsatisfactory, but more find the second marriage as unsatisfactory as the first.

Fortunately, comparatively few of the total divorces, approximately 37 per cent, involve children. The father usually objects to divorce in case there are children because he knows the court will probably give their custody to the mother, separating him from them and requiring him to pay alimony for their support.

Divorce is extremely expensive to society where there are children in the home. Various studies have shown that children of divorced parents have greater difficulty in making normal adjustments to life and later to marriage than children of successful marriages. Other difficulties are apparent in the case of the child from the divorced home, as all studies of juvenile delinquency demonstrate.

Society has ceased to be very greatly concerned about the divorce of man and wife but dare not so lightly view the rights of children. One cannot recommend, however, that laws be made more rigid and that greater restrictions be imposed upon divorce as such. There is no advantage to continuing marriage, even when children are involved, if an established pattern of antagonistic relationships exists.

One of the most convincing analyses on this point is that by Plant. Writing for judges involved in the legal processes of the divorce courts, he points out that in working with couples in the divorce court, judges are in reality in many cases providing a solution to a marriage which, considering the state which the marriage has reached, is the best possible solution from the standpoint of the child. He found that 10 times as many children were sent to the Essex County Juvenile Clinic from separated parents as from divorced parents. Less disturbance was shown in the lives of children of divorced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents than in those of separated parents.

In granting the divorce decree and in assigning the child to one parent and making whatever financial arrangements are necessary, the court is often doing the most it can to remedy a situation from the standpoint of the welfare of the child. Divorce is not a desirable solution but it is a much better solution than to permit the child to continue to live in a home where conflict has become the established pattern. At times divorce is a great relief to the child. Divorce in itself is a mere incident in a situation of insecurity that has long since done its damage.

In presenting argumentative evidence, Plant points out that parents are rarely concerned, when in conflict, with the welfare of the child. Three situations are characteristic. Parents in conflict use the child as a pawn in fighting each other; one parent uses the child as an argument against the other parent to hold the marriage together, or one parent uses the child to express his bitterness against the other parent, pouring into the child's ears all the real or imaginary offenses of the other parent. The catastrophic effect of such an experience on the emotional life of the child is obvious.

If Plant is right in this analysis, public attitudes which heap shame on couples with children who resort to divorce, hinder the solution to many family conflicts which in reality have no other solution that is equally as good as divorce.

Every generation has had to contend with the disintegrating forces which challenge the integrity of the family and which constitute a risk to successful marriage. Few periods, however, have presented so many challenges to the family as has the twentieth century. Twice during the century the disintegrating influence of war has made its impact on the family. Two succeeding generations have experienced the let-down in moral standards that is part of war and post-war re-adjustment. Two war generations inspired by the heated romance of crisis have ignored basic personality differences, common traditions and common interests in mate selection and paid the price of getting acquainted after marriage.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Those who dream of a more stable family in the immediate future are indulging in wishful thinking. There is little in the current trend of social forces to point to an early solution of the basic underlying factors which produce divorce in so high a proportion of marriages. It is doubtful if the companionship family will realize greater stability until some of the present efforts to check romance and guide it by scientific investigation, personality testing, measurements for marriage fitness, pre-marital counselling and other such scientific devices reach the stage where they can be presented to the public with confidence and be used by a substantial proportion of youth.

It is doubtful that the American family system is going to expect less of marriage in the future than it does now in the way of happiness and romantic realization. This being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the case, a more complete understanding of personality and the effect of background factors on marriage would seem to be the way forward. We must devise social measures which will come nearer to insuring that the right people marry and that they marry the right person. In addition to this, further improvement is needed in helping people who are married to understand the frictions and tensions that are inherent in a close daily companionship and to give them a greater understanding and assistance so that they may meet these situations with a degree of intelligence and understanding.

This is the way forward rather than to cry for the return of the institutional values of the family of yesterday. Youth want more stable marriages and the nation needs them but will not pay the price of conflict and dissatisfaction for stability.

Divorce is an integral part of the companionship family system as developed in America. It is as much a part of it as our unsupervised courtship and our unbridled romance. As long as we put marriage to the supreme test of personal happiness and individualistic satisfaction, we must choose between two alternatives; either, place mate selection on a more reasonable basis and build marriage on a more secure foundation and thereby make an enduring happiness possible, or else expect the fires of romance to quickly cool in the prosaic associations of daily life as poorly mated individuals discover each other in the cold light of reason after the marriage ceremony rather than before. We must either take the intelligent road or expect an increasing number of marriages to end in annulment or divorce.

There is little hope that individualism will be less emphasized in our society than at present. The war has greatly developed the individualistic tendencies of both men and women. Even in its most ideal form, marriage is frustrating to certain of the individualistic interests of both men and women. It is especially frustrating to the individualistic interests of women. Marriage must actually net the kind of satisfactions which the companionship family claims for itself if it is to be durable, to bring children to maturity and to maintain itself as an institution worthy of the life-long allegiance of an individualistic people.

• Young Mrs. Grogan was attending her first football game. The home team was doing well that day, and for a time she patiently endured her husband's gyrations. But when, amid the cheering, howling crowd, he sprang upon his seat, waved his new hat three times around his head and almost shattered it on the fat man in front, Mrs. Grogan exclaimed:

"What on earth's the matter, John?"

"Why, dearie," he answered, as soon as he could get his breath, "didn't you see the goalman catch the ball?"

"Of course," said young Mrs. Grogan. "I thought that was what he was there for."

—*The Sign*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eugen Richter was a "fighting liberal"

Bismarck's Enemy

By Felix E. Hirsch

Associate Professor of European History and Librarian at Bard College; former political editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*

POLITICIANS and pseudo-historians of various kinds have told the American public for some years that all Germans tend to adulate their leaders and to follow their commands slavishly. Evidently there is some truth in their observations, but the real historian knows that he must beware of hasty generalizations, since they may undermine the validity of his whole argument. Everybody has learned with horror of the unspeakable atrocities committed by fanatic Nazis who executed the inhuman orders of their superiors without a moment's hesitation. Fewer people are familiar with the fact that hundreds of thousands of Germans died in concentration camps because they dared to oppose the tenets of the Third Reich. Many authors are now in the habit of quoting Heinrich von Treitschke profusely. The harmless reader might easily be led by them to believe that the whole German intelligentsia of his day looked up to Bismarck as to a demi-god the way Treitschke did. Actually, however, most of the German "immortals," such as Hermann Helmholtz, Theodor Mommsen and Rudolf Virchow, scorned the political methods of the Iron Chancellor, and the latter two fought him in parliament relentlessly.

The singular power and prestige which Bismarck enjoyed for 28 years over-shadows somehow the fact that a majority of the *Reichstag* opposed him vigorously on many occasions. These representatives of the people knew that, under the existing constitutional set-up, they had no hope of unseating the leading statesman who was responsible to the emperor only, but they did not relax their efforts to protect the rights of the common man. Three dominating figures stood out among these fighters: the Socialist August Bebel, the Liberal Eugen Richter and the Catholic Centrist Ludwig Windthorst. The Chancellor hated them all, but he detested none more than he did Eugen Richter. By his fearless criticism, Richter aroused Bismarck's anger to the point that he would often leave the *Reichstag* in a fury, as soon as the liberal leader took the floor and started to nettle him by his incessant questions: "Does the Chancellor know . . .?". There Richter stood, a second Cato, who might say about himself the words of Lucanus that the conquering cause was pleasing to the gods,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the conquered, to him. In a real parliamentary democracy, such as England, a man of his political talent and profound knowledge would have become Chancellor of the Exchequer in due course of time. In imperial Germany, however, he was unable to hold the job of a small-town mayor. He was left to repeating his scathing comments on Bismarck's policies in his *Reichstag* speeches which rarely, if ever, would have visible results on the actions of the government. When the Chancellor Prince Bernhard von Bülow once remarked he had recommended Richter, then a sick old man, to the Emperor as secretary of the treasury, this was generally taken as a joke; for in those days any bureaucrat seemed preferable for a responsible position to a first-rate expert who was also a politician of character.

The life of such a parliamentarian who is doomed to fight a losing battle and who cannot pride himself on any great constructive achievement is hard to write. Forty years after his death, Richter has not yet been honored by an adequate biography. His own memoirs, pungent essays by his fellow liberals Theodor Barth, Friedrich Naumann and Hermann Pachnicke, and the learned monographs by Felix Rachfahl (in *Zeitshrift für Politik,* vol. 5, 1912) and Leopold Ullstein (Leipsic, 1930) fill the gap somehow. There is no literature at all on Richter in the English language. Perhaps only now, after the German collapse, do we possess the right historical perspective on the whole Bismarck era. An indication of this may be the fact that the definitive biography of the Chancellor was not written until the Second World War by Erich Eyck, who as an exile in Switzerland produced this monumental three volume work. A re-appraisal of the leaders of the anti-Bismarck front seems also now in order.

REARGUARD ACTION

In the history of German liberalism, it fell to Eugen Richter to fight a rearguard action The decisive battle about principles was over when he started on his political career. Two generations before, Wilhelm von Humboldt, the great Prussian reformer and humanistic thinker of Goethe's day, had led the vanguard of the liberal forces. The issue of the century was lost, when in the revolution of 1848 the National Assembly in the Frankfurt *Paulskirche* failed so signally in its attempt to create a German democracy under a Hohenzollern emperor. The unification, eventually, was achieved under the leadership of Bismarck, a Prussian Junker, by "blood and iron," and the Liberals played only a minor part in this historic process. The Chancellor drafted the constitution of the Empire primarily to suit himself, even though he did not disregard some postulates of the moderate Liberals. In the framework of his *Reich,* however, there was left for men of Eugen Richter's unyielding type no other function but that of defender of the people's cause in parliament. His political activity, said Theodor Barth, was like a tree which is covered with blossoms, but afterwards does not bear fruit.

Eugen Richter was born in the Rhenish city of Düsseldorf on July 30, 1838. He had little of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charm and cheerfulness often attributed to Rhinelanders. His father was *Generalarzt* in the Prussian army, i.e., he was chief physician of an army corps, but he held political and scientific views unusually progressive for such a high dignitary. It is from him that Eugen seems to have inherited the indomitable spirit of opposition. Young Richter left the *Gymnasium* as a determined liberal. His student years in Bonn, Berlin and Heidelberg gave him a more solid foundation for his convictions. Particularly at Heidelberg he felt that he was in a congenial intellectual atmosphere, and the teachings of Karl Heinrich Rau, the famous professor of economics at the *Ruperto Carola,* made him a lifelong follower of the classical school. He joined the "Economic Congress," a powerful organization for the promotion of the free trade ideal, and participated in the consumers cooperative movement; it was then flourishing in Germany under the leadership of the liberal politician Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch, one of whose intimate associates he soon became.

Richter's studies had been meant to prepare him for a career in the Prussian civil service, but he did not last long in it. He was too independent and too uncompromising; the unwelcome caustic critic was given one reprimand after another. Finally, when the municipal council of the Rhenish town of Neuwied elected him burgomaster, the supervising authorities refused to confirm him. This was enough; Eugen Richter resigned from the civil service and became a political writer. Thirty years later, Bismarck confided in retrospect to Maximilian Harden, "It was foolish to refuse his confirmation. He would not have been dangerous in the municipal service, and I believe he, with his financial talents, would have made an excellent burgomaster." It is open to doubt, whether or not Richter's ambitions in the long run would have been satisfied in the narrow confines of a town administration. On the other hand, it seems unjudicious to explain his later negative attitude against the state merely by this one unpleasant experience of his early days. Richter did not become Bismarck's opponent from personal frustration so much as from deep-rooted conviction.

On Schulze-Delitzsch's recommendation, the voters of Nordhausen elected his young friend a member of the North-German constituent assembly. Thus, Richter, less than 29 years old, entered the *Reichstag* and, as a matter of course, joined there the ranks of the Progressive Party, the rallying center of the anti-governmental forces. With one brief interruption, he was regularly returned both to the German and the Prussian parliaments. By his singular diligence and thoroughness as a budget expert, he soon acquired a prominent position in the Progressive group. He became its chairman on the death of Baron Leopold von Hoverbeck in 1875, whose trusted lieutenant he had been till then. For thirty years, he was the unchallenged leader of the more radical liberals.

The man who fought Bismarck's autocratic methods tooth and nail, was by no means a pleasant political "boss" himself but resembled his great adversary in his behavior. Richter wanted to force his will on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his associates. "My ideal," he once said to Hermann Pachnicke, "is a parliamentary group of 15 men with whom I am able to maneuver." He antagonized many fellow workers who differed with him on details and attacked them recklessly in his various journalistic outlets His dictatorial attitude, according to Leopold Ullstein, is explained by his underlying fear that otherwise the Bismarck magic might lure the liberal leaders away from their duty. To a considerable extent, the decay of his party in later days was due to his amazing intolerance and rudeness. Friedrich Naumann, to whom the leadership of German liberalism was eventually to fall, commented after Richter's death: "He used to hide his sunny side from us. We knew that he had the ability to be polite, but we learned about it by indirection only."

Eugen Richter was one of the first Germans to make politics his profession. This was considered rather shocking in his day, and Bismarck used this fact often as an argument against him. The Chancellor did not realize that Germany needed nothing more badly than well-trained and unselfish political leaders; his shortsightedness in this respect cost his country dearly.

Richter had two weapons which he used masterfully: his talents as an orator and as a journalist. The one gave him fame; the other, an independent income. For a later generation, it is hard to appraise the rhetorical abilities of a man; sentences that once electrified an audience, may look dull on paper. Richter's speeches, however, make interesting reading even today; they are like an oasis in the desert of the stenographic *Reichstag* reports. Bismarck, usually the target of his biting attacks, acknowledged later to Harden: "Richter was probably the best speaker whom we had. Very well informed and diligent; with unpleasant manners, but a man of character." Theodor Barth, his unsuccessful competitor for the leadership of liberalism, praised Richter's unusual dialectic talent after his death. Bismarck was not up to it which was why he lost his temper so often. Pachnicke felt that Richter "often found the right word in great hours, but there were limits to his vision." These are the judgments of critical observers. To his own followers, he was the political speaker *par excellence*. Relatives of the present writer praised, in the nineteen-twenties, Richter's addresses as the decisive political experiences of their lives. There is only one dissenting opinion, that of Prince Bülow, who met Richter, however, when the liberal leader had long passed his prime: "I found him as a speaker barely second-rate. He spoke with a long slip in his hand on which he had noted down not only his points, but the jokes he meant to make. One could see from his face when the joke was due to come. And the same joke would come too often . . ."

As a party journalist, Richter was certainly unique in his day. He started out selling his articles in multigraphed form to liberal Sunday papers outside Berlin. After a while, he founded a weekly of his own, the *Reichsfreund*. In 1885 he established a daily, the *Freisinnige Zeitung*, which was devoted almost exclusive-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly to promoting his political aims. It was a monument to its founder's singleness of purpose. He used the paper as a powerful weapon not only against his enemies of whom there were many, but also against his friends, whenever they did not adhere strictly to the party line. Objectivity of news presentation was alien to him, and his editorials would excel in vehement vituperations. Richter, the political propagandist, was at his best in his pamphlets. Some of them were little masterpieces of partisan invective; they were widely read and added to his income. His greatest success in this field was his *Pictures of the Socialist Future* (Translation published in New York, 1893.). This cleverly conceived utopian satire tried to demonstrate in a witty and imaginative fashion how Marxist doctrines would work out in practice, if there ever came about a social revolution in Germany; family life would be ruined, hard-earned savings lost, and any ambitious and self-respecting youth forced eventually to emigrate to America. The pamphlet was purchased by hundreds of thousands. Its regular sale amounted to 20,000 copies as late as 1919. Anti-Bolshevist Russian elements placed an order for 500,000 copies about that time but were turned down by the mistrustful publishing house.

If we compare Richter to German liberal leaders of an earlier day or to his great English contemporaries—Gladstone, Rosebery and Asquith—we are rather struck by his one-sidedness. He was not deeply interested in the fine arts or in literature; he did not travel abroad or follow closely the political and cultural trends in other countries. He concentrated on German domestic problems and was the unrivaled parliamentary expert on the budget. He served, Naumann said, as a kind of district attorney for the national finances. Since Bismarck had excluded the *Reichstag* from any other major function, Richter felt that at least the right of financial control should be taken seriously by the representatives of the taxpayers. He would examine annually every single budget item with a detective's eye. It may be that he tended to overrate the importance of these details and was only too eager to put up a life-and-death struggle about some of them. Barth bitterly blamed him for not understanding that one sometimes must throw some part of the cargo overboard in order to save the whole boat. The voters, certainly, did not always appreciate Richter's uncompromising attitude and turned away from his party on various critical occasions.

POLITICAL CREED

Richter's political credo consisted of a few basic tenets. Although Bismarck called him a *"Reichsfeind"*, an enemy of the Empire, he was a genuine patriot but free from the vice of aggressive nationalism. The details of foreign policy concerned him but little as long as the trend was toward better international understanding. His dominant interest was to promote his ideal of parliamentary control at home. In this he differed essentially from his political neighbors to the right, the National Liberals, who often sacrificed their domestic doctrines for the sake of a stronger Germany. Gustav

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stresemann, the National Liberal son of a Progressive father, said very characteristically many years later: "He who places principle above everything should deposit his wreath not on the monument of Bismarck but on that of Eugen Richter. It is a symptom of political mediocrity to insist, in all circumstances, on the maintenance of a principle."

Richter upheld the right of the *Reichstag* to review annually the army appropriations and, in 1887, would rather go down in defeat than assent to the *Septennat,* which fixed these expenses for seven years. Neither the acquisition of colonies nor the development of a battle fleet appealed to his imagination. When Prince Bülow tried to make his naval building program palatable to him, he said: "Perhaps you are right. But I am too old to follow this turn of events." The strength of his liberal convictions was tested when he, differing from many of his friends, refused to follow Bismarck in his attempt to outlaw the Catholic Church in the so-called *Kulturkampf.* Later, he did not approve of the anti-Socialist legislation, even though his relations with the Social Democrats had begun to deteriorate.

Having been brought up in the rigid traditions of the Manchester school, Richter never wavered in his faith that free trade had to be the guiding principle for the national economy. He opposed Bismarck's turn to protectionism with all the eloquence he had at his disposal. Political liberalism and free trade were for Richter but two aspects of the same thing: "Economic freedom," he said in a great *Reichstag* address in 1879, "is insecure without political freedom." He denounced the whole tariff legislation.

LABOR

His idiosyncrasy against state interference, unfortunately, made him blind against the necessity to improve the lot of the working class. Under his leadership the Progressives voted even against the politically harmless accident insurance law which formed part of Bismarck's social security program. The older he grew, the less did Richter, the extreme liberal individualist, understand the ramifications of the German labor problem. As a young man, he had been a delegate to the congress of the German workers associations in *Frankfurt am Main.* There he had met August Bebel for the first time. But later he lost interest in and perspective for the social issues and attacked the Social Democratic party with increasing tenacity. It would have been the natural thing for a far-sighted democratic politician toward the turn of the century to bring about a closer cooperation between the rising labor class and the liberal bourgeoisie. But when Richter died, both seemed hopelessly embroiled, and the Socialist leaders cursed him in his grave as a "traitor" and a "scoundrel." Bismarck and Richter, says Naumann, had the same limitation: they did not wish to admit that the proletariat had begun to become a political factor.

It was Eugen Richter's tragic fate to consume his energies as a leader of the opposition in that "hall of repetitions," the German *Reichstag;*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no law, no treaty, no act of progress bears his name. Would the man have been changed, if he had been given the responsible rôle of a statesman? There was a moment in history when Richter did not seem to be far from that goal. It was in 1884 that the Progressives and the former left wing of the National Liberals buried the hatchet in order to be ready when the Crown Prince Frederick William would succeed his aging father William I. But he ascended to the throne a dying man himself. In the 99 days of his rule, he had little opportunity to realize his own liberal ideals; only here and there could he indicate his agreement with the editor of the *Freisinnige Zeitung*. If Frederick III had lived longer, Richter might have seen his dream of a parliamentary government fulfilled and received some important position in it himself. Then his negative criticism might have mellowed and his doctrines been adapted to the demands of the times. The fiery demagogue might have turned into a wise statesman. It was to the detriment of Germany that Eugen Richter did not receive this opportunity.

• A woman who had never enjoyed many comforts or pleasures in her life was seeing the ocean for the first time. She stood with folded hands and looked at it.

"It's the first thing I've ever seen," she said, "that there's enough of."

• A father and his three-year-old were pushed into the back of a jammed street car at the rush hour. A kindly old lady turned to the man and said, "Aren't you afraid your little boy will be badly squashed?"

"Not a chance, lady," he replied. "He bites."

• The wife of the junior senator from Iowa arrived at the Congressional club to "pour" at a reception for the Trumans.

"Now," said the flurried chairman, "Mrs. Olin Johnston, of South Carolina, is pouring at the same table. Which of your husbands is senior senator?"

"They came to the Senate at the same time," Mrs. Bourke Hickenlooper replied.

"Well then," the resourceful hostess asked, "which state entered the union first?"

Mrs. Hickenlooper pointed out that South Carolina had been one of the original colonies whereas Iowa had been "in" for only a scant century.

"Ah," said the chairman, "then Mrs. Johnston pours coffee; you pour tea.'

—*Minneapolis Tribune*

(Lucky it wasn't a Saltonstall!)

• A woman was interviewing a prospective maid. As they were about to conclude their agreement, the girl asked: "Do you do your own stretchin'?"

"Do we do our own what?" the woman asked.

"Stretchin'," repeated the girl. "Do you put all the food on the table at dinner and stretch for it, or do I have to shuffle it around?"

—*Clappers Weekly*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A survey of the movie industry

Is Hollywood Growing Up?—I

By Max Knepper

Author and Columnist

AS a commercial enterprise, Hollywood has grown up. From beginnings too humble to have inspired organized statistical records, the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures have grown to a multi-million-dollar industry. In 1945 the major producing and distributing companies grossed almost $750,000,000, a figure comprising better than 50 per cent of the total gross of Hollywood's hundred odd companies. There are eight major concerns of which two—Columbia and Universal—do not distribute and one, United Artists, which distributes but does not produce. Exact figures are not available, as many independents do not publish financial statements, but on the basis of data released by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., it is possible to estimate the industry's aggregate revenues for 1945 in excess of a billion and a half dollars.

So far as economic giants are concerned, the movies do not occupy an impressive niche, ranking only forty-fifth in a list of 94 industrial groups indexed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. For the benefit of the statistical-minded, the current value of all studios and equipment in Hollywood does not exceed $150,000,000, the big capital investment being in the exhibition end—the theaters. This is estimated at around a billion dollars according to figures cited by the industry. (It is only fair to add they may not be authentic.)

However, the commercial rank of the motion picture industry is of subordinate interest to most people. It is in its rôle as a purveyor of entertainment, artistic or otherwise, that the cinema assumes importance to a public ranging from clergymen, critics, educators and artists to the vast mass of movie addicts estimated at 90,000,000.

While the commercial standing of motion pictures can be determined mathematically, an artistic evaluation poses a far more complex problem, involving as it does the tastes and prejudices of the evaluator, the fact that a motion picture is not an artistic unity but the product of several arts and many crafts, and that the movies, though to a more limited degree than the publishing trade, purposely produce for various levels of demand.

There are still those critics and sociologists who refuse to consider films seriously at all, or, if they do appraise them, maintain that in general they have a detrimental influence on the cultural standards of the community. In the infancy of the industry, such a criticism applied too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

closely for comfort, but it would be difficult to sustain any such broad condemnation of Hollywood in this decade if one considers that, since 1937, the studios have released such films as:

Dead End, Winterset, Fantasia, Citizen Kane, Pygmalion, The Grapes of Wrath, Wuthering Heights, Juarez, Abe Lincoln in Illinois, Our Town, Rebecca, Gone With The Wind, Dr. Ehrlich's Magic Bullet, The Long Voyage Home, G. I. Joe, The Southerner, Our Vines Have Tender Grapes, Ox-Bow Incident, Watch on the Rhine, National Velvet, Going My Way, The Corn Is Green, Keys of the Kingdom, Wilson, Pride of the Marines, A Tree Grows in Brooklyn, Song To Remember (notable as a musical document, not as a biography of Chopin) and *The Lost Weekend.*

This list is offered not as a personal selection of the best for a given period, but as representative of Hollywood's more serious products and because these films have received the widest critical acclaim. It is interesting to note that 40 of the 390 feature-length pictures released by Hollywood in 1945 were adjudged worthy of favorable comment by 17 critics or critical boards of review. Of the 442 feature-length pictures made in 1944, 60 were selected by a poll of 479 critics, commentators, magazine reviewers, and radio reviewers for a roll of honor, including the "10 best" which were: *Going My Way, The Song of Bernadette, Since You Went Away, Madame Curie, Dragon Seed, The White Cliffs of Dover, Gaslight, A Guy Named Joe, The Story of Dr. Wassell,* and *Lifeboat.*

Particularly in the fields of art direction, cinematography and music, Hollywood has made recent, notable strides toward distinction as a mature and valuable art medium.

As an art medium, the motion picture is indeed young—the first screening occurred just 40 years ago—but it is not the purpose of this article to justify Hollywood's cultural demerits on the grounds of newness. Comparison with other cultural mediums, though perhaps odious, is not to be avoided, for it would be patently unfair to the screen to judge it by absolute standards of criticism without reference to allied forms such as radio, stage and the publishing business.

Viewing the motion picture industry as a whole (the majors, the several quality independents, the unique Walt Disney productions, the "quickies," westerns, and sex-confession-exposé output), it seems fair to say it ranks on a cultural level with magazine publishing, above the radio with its comedians, soap operas, hillbillies, and commercials, far below the opera stage and concert hall, and a little below what remains of the legitimate theater.

Although exact comparison with the magazine field is difficult, due to the finer shading of quality in the periodicals, there is a certain basis for analogy. Authors know that in the magazine market a group known as the "qualities" publish material for discerning readers and that work slanted for their pages must be well-written and bear an authentic relationship to life. Fiction published in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such books is intellectually superior to virtually all movie scenarios.

Next to the "qualities" in editorial standards, and ahead of them in circulation, are the "slicks." Articles and fiction in these publications vary in degree of sophistication and literary perfection (*Cosmopolitan* and *The Saturday Evening Post,* for example). These boys often carry prestige names and some of their pieces rank with the "qualities," but by and large their circulation mainstays are such names as Kathleen Norris, Faith Baldwin, Edna Ferber, or Fannie Hurst, whose output few critics would rank with the works of John Steinbeck, Dorothy Parker, Willa Cather, Ellen Glasgow, Erskine Caldwell or Upton Sinclair. In terms of intellectual or artistic standards, the fiction of the "slicks" lends itself to comparison with the "A" productions of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Warner Brothers, Sam Goldwyn, and other studios of their class.

Descending the scale in the periodicals, we find in the pulps the same intellectual qualities to be experienced in most of Hollywood's "B" productions. The western pulps match the western movies and confession-risque books have their prototype in the "quickies" of the sin-and-repentance sort shown in skidrow movie houses.

However, the gap between the best and worst in films seems less wide than in contemporary published works, for, while the best films seldom, if ever, match the best novels, neither do the worst approach in vulgarity or vacuity many of the publications sold regularly on newsstands. But this fact does not obviate the implication involved in the circumstance that, despite the considerable talent at its command, the motion picture industry seems unable to achieve on its highest level the same heights scaled by the novel or stage. Classics both new and old are frequently brought to the screen, but somehow they rarely capture those qualities which made the originals distinctive as works of art. For this there are three principal reasons: commercial considerations, censorship and the improper use of writing talent by studio executives.

ECONOMIC FACTOR

The first of these obstacles is probably the most important and certainly the least amenable to remedy, involving as it does the economic factor. Of the 29 films listed in this piece as evidence of Hollywood's claim on the critic's serious attention, almost a third are definitely known to have lost money or to have returned only a token profit. *Abe Lincoln In Illinois, Our Town, The Long Voyage Home, Juarez, Escape, Mortal Storm, Confessions of a Nazi Spy,* and *Fantasia* were not money-makers. How many others of this class failed at the box-office is conjectural, as producers understandably do not care to advertise their financial lemons to their competitors.

An "A" picture is generally based on a literary property purchased at a price anywhere from $35,000 up. According to a major executive recently interviewed, it cannot be produced for less than $800,000 under present conditions. To recover

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cost of the negative, an aggregate of from 10 to 20 million paid admissions is necessary, depending on the number of first run theaters exhibiting the film. This thought is uppermost in the mind of the producer and, if the play or novel he is making happens to contain matter he thinks unlikely to please 20,000,000 admissions, the temptation to modify it is too great for human resistance, even if the price is mutilation of the original artistry. Herein lies the explanation of the beating which tragedy in particular suffers in Hollywood: most producers are adamant in their conviction that tragedy is synonymous with red ink.

A case in point is the current Academy winner, *The Lost Weekend*. Readers of Mr. Jackson's novel are aware that the film, an excellent document though it is, departs from the book's conclusion by a variation which does not make for authentic characterization or plausible plot solution. What happened is that Paramount first filmed the story exactly as it was written, previewed it at a Los Angeles suburban theater, and decided from audience reaction that a positive, happy ending would have to be provided the alcoholic hero. A little film cutting and a few retakes seemed all the situation demanded, but unhappily the ways of the public are devious and fickle. About as many theater-goers objected to the unconvincing retakes as had dissented from the true ending. So, in an effort to please all hands, the studio filmed a third ending which was a compromise between the novel's psychologically authentic finish and the traditional Hollywood happy finale.

The critic is apt to find it difficult to excuse commercial gestures of this kind, and one is tempted to speculate whether the film's initial ending would have been less satisfactory at the boxoffice than the present version. To the surprise of its producers, the film was actually making money even prior to its receiving the Academy Award.

Apropos of the value of previews as boxoffice barometers, a Paramount executive raised an interesting point in his discussion of *The Lost Weekend* case. "When we preview a film," he said, "we put out a notice advertising it as such. The public doesn't know what is to be shown, and people who select their entertainment remain away. Half or more of a preview audience consists of 'bobby-soxers' and adolescents who come in the sole hope of seeing their favorite celebrities." The inference is inescapable that in cases where producers are influenced by preview audience reactions—and this seems to be the majority—immature minds are responsible for the revisions undertaken, rather than the film editors, authors, directors, and players.

On the other hand, when one considers that western pictures costing from a third to a half of a quality picture, are invariably profitable and often return their costs within six months in contrast to the two or three years usually required to return the charges on an "A" picture, the marvel is that some producers risk as much as they do to please patrons of higher tastes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Only an intransigent visionary would insist that motion picture producers should assume the costly responsibility of raising the dramatic discernments of the entire public, though there are some who might argue that the eight companies which enjoy a virtual monopoly in the production or distribution of entertainment films have a limited obligation in this regard. The most a reasonable person can demand is that a certain effort be exerted toward providing greater selectivity so that the important medium of the screen could provide drama for those whose intelligence demands plausible characterization and convincing plot action.

The possibility of attaining such selectivity seems to lie in reducing production costs and in obtaining a more satisfactory exhibition outlet. A clue exists in the following breakdown of production costs:

	per cent
Cast	25.00
Extras	5.
Directorial	12.
Camera and crew	1.5
Lights	2.
Make-up	0.9
Teacher	0.2
Crew and labor	1.2
Story preparation	7.
Story costs	5.
Costumes	2.0
Sets and art	12.5
Stills	.4
Cutters	.1
Film negative	.1
Insurance	1.2
Sound	3.1
Publicity, research, technical direction	2.0
Executive costs	15.0

Many of the items listed above are comprised in an irreducible minimum, costs which would accrue under any production system. In fact, analysis of this breakdown reveals only five cost groups which lend themselves to reduction—cast, director and assistants, story costs, story preparation, and executive and financing. But since these costs represent 64 per cent of the total, it is apparent that a substantial cut in these categories would effect important savings.

The following question was submitted to five important studio executives: Assuming that some of our more serious authors, actors and directors decided to produce films for intellectually mature audiences on a profit-sharing basis, or at salaries not to exceed $500 a week, would lack of a release be the only bar to success, or do you think there would be insufficient public demand to support such a venture?

One producer answered that a project of this type would be impractical because "artists, especially writers, can't promote." The others felt that obtaining a release and proper exhibition under prevailing conditions would prove an insuperable obstacle.

A cooperative organization of writers, directors and actors in which salaries would be modest and managerial talent limited to one or two persons could produce quality films at two-thirds their present costs and reduce accordingly the need for popular acceptance. Nor is such a scheme as utopian as it might seem at first glance. As long as they remain merely salaried employees, there is no reason why

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

artists should accept less money than they can command in the market. But as a participating member in a producing company, the greater security of the artist and the larger measure of control over his work would probably offset the possible disadvantage of lower compensation.

SALARIES

And the financial sacrifice, if there were one, would not be as great as might appear on first consideration. The present income tax schedule is all but confiscatory of the swollen Hollywood salaries. Except for prestige, the artist benefits but little from a salary in excess of $500 a week. Director John Stahl stated the case pungently in regard to his own $4,000 weekly salary:

"Hollywood's large salaries are unnecessary except for one thing. That is respect. If you don't earn a king's ransom in the movie business, nobody respects you. And if they don't respect you, you can't get work. So you've got to demand a tremendously stiff fee for your services or you don't make movies. Then you give back most of this money to the government and you worry about your financial affairs and you'd be better off if you earned only a fraction of your weekly check. So would the industry."

Control of their own productions would be a considerable incentive. According to Leo Rosten's book, 133 film writers out of 169 criticized the quality of screen plays they were forced to turn out, while almost 55 per cent of the directors who replied to Rosten's poll remarked unfavorably on the intellectual and artistic level of American films.

The trend is already toward the objective outlined here. Of the approximately 1000 active members of the Screen Writers Guild, about 100 are now writer-producers exercising more control over choice and treatment of material than would have been thought possible a few years ago. A number of the more outstanding directors have also become producers. However, they are still operating within the framework of the studio commercial system and are still hampered by it.

But assuming that they could exercise complete freedom and elected to do films comparable with the best in fiction, the theatre, and music, could their productions be profitably exhibited? "Art" theaters are few. Of the near 16,000 motion picture houses in the United States, probably not more than two dozen could be so classified. A profitable outlet could not possibly be found in these few. It is not beyond question, however, to suggest that a circuit like Loew's or Warner Brothers' might find it profitable to cater to discriminating, sophisticated patrons in one or two of their houses in populous communities. The question, of course, is whether they *would* do it. But whether the major circuits pioneer in this field or leave it to some enterprising independents, the day is not too distant when motion picture entertainment will achieve a reasonable selectivity. No artistic legere-main exists whereby a movie can be made palatable to the fans of both Horatio Alger, Jr. and Theodore Dreiser.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our "asylums" have a long way to go

New Deal for the Mentally Ill?

By Ed Ritter

Principal-elect of the School for Organic Education, Fairhope, Alabama

SELECTIVE Service revealed last year that psychiatric disorders were accounting for almost 30 per cent of all rejections for military service, and for 40 per cent of all medical discharges from the services. Since 1923, the rate of admissions to mental hospitals has risen from 241.7 to 364.2 per 100,000 population. Patients on mental hospital beds now outnumber general hospital patients.

Your chance of requiring treatment in a mental hospital for some portion of your life is one in twenty. Admission rates among men are higher than among women. (A fact which the average male is inclined to explain in terms of the stresses associated with understanding and serving the inscrutable sex.) If you are a man, your chance of being admitted is greatest between your thirty-fifth and thirty-ninth birthdays; if a woman, between your thirtieth and thirty-fourth.

If you are single, your possibility of going to a mental hospital is 2.4 times as great as that of your married friends[1]; if you are divorced it is even greater. If you're a city-dweller, your likelihood of admission is twice that of rural folk.

[1] This ratio, based on a study of 28,000 consecutive admissions, is corrected for the factor of age difference between these marital groups.

The *if* with which this article is chiefly concerned, however, is: If you were the one in twenty, how would you be treated during your illness? With thousands of veterans psychiatrically disabled by the war, new attention should be paid our principal remedial agency—the mental hospital. Knowledge of what happens beyond the broad green lawns and the red brick walls of these state institutions is important for two reasons: (1) ignorance concerning the nature and treatment of mental disorders is a dark area in which the fear-germs of mental disease thrive; and (2) our mental hospital administrations face peculiarly pressing needs at this time which they can meet only through public understanding and help.

When the man on the street is asked what he knows of his half-million fellow citizens in mental hospitals, his answer is often based on darkly imagined scenes of screaming maniacs thrashing about in barred cells. Suppose he's persuaded to go on a journey with us to a modern mental hospital.

It's noon and he's led into the dining room where over half of the hospital's 3,000 patients are eating.

"Why these people don't appear to be crazy!" he protests.

Reading his mind, the dining

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

room attendant explains that only six to seven per cent of the institution's patients are violent—only one in sixty assaultive.

Classical pipe organ music played by one of the patients lays a smoothing atmosphere as it swells over the huge room. The service is cafeteria. The lines of patients who are still waiting for their trays are orderly. Table manners are spotty; nevertheless, the visitor is impressed by the general competence of the patients and by their freedom to return to their wards and day-yards individually. Most mental patients go through these institution routines without causing confusion.

"FRONT" WARDS

Passing through shiny, mildly disinfectant-scented corridors, the visitor comes first to the "front wards". They are airy, and the white, five-foot high, tile cubicles containing four beds each provide as much privacy as is practicable.

Several patients are enjoying after-dinner cigarettes as they sit on their beds talking or reading. As it's a sunny day, others are in the high-walled day-yard adjoining the ward. Most of the occupants of the front wards are not present, however. Being the most competent patients, it is they who do most of the maintenance work—cooking, farming and scrubbing.

As we trip more of these wards—institutional wards are always "tripped", never "visited"—some of the patients step up to have a word with us. "I am Winston Churchill's daughter's husband," one confides. "Have you a personal Savior?" inquires another. But another, a personable young chap, enters into an entirely rational conversation with us. The attendant later explains that many patients are quite sound when not dwelling on certain subjects or when not under emotional stress. The personable young man, for instance, had been committed to the institution after botching his part of a mutual suicide pact with his sweetheart, and, on more casual subjects, his mind was logical. We are reminded of Hamlet's saying, "I am only mad north-northwest."

As in general hospitals, the patients come from all stations of life—there are penniless vagabonds and successful business men and women.

They are in all stages of recovery. During 1942, over 30,000 persons were discharged as improved; 16,000 others were pronounced recovered upon discharge. Over 65,000 were on parole. But the myth that mental disease is incurable goes on taking its toll in human despair.

Mental diseases are almost as varied as the illnesses treated in a general hospital. The largest general category is schizophrenia, accounting for about 60 per cent of the total mental hospital population. Victims of simple schizophrenia are characterized by their seclusive makeup, delusions, and carelessness about personal cleanliness and appearance. Those of the hebephrenic type think themselves under the control of some exterior, supernatural power. Those suffering from the catatonic type are negative and tend to became muscularly rigid; they like to hold a favorite pose—perhaps kneeling or holding one arm out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stretched—for hours. Other patients call it "making a statue". Those of the paranoid type think others are plotting against them; they have delusions of grandeur and delusions of persecution.

There is agony in this splitting of personality which the casual observer can occasionally glimpse. One morning a young man of my acquaintance tensely urged me to speak with him privately. As he was an extreme introvert, his extraordinary display of emotion arrested my attention. He was pale and perspiration stood on his forehead. As he clutched one hand with the other, his nails dug into his flesh. With a frightened, sobbing voice he tried to describe how clearly "a voice" kept telling him to do a specific dreadful act that was utterly repulsive to his rational mind. For a whole, terrible night he had lain awake hearing and repudiating the voice. "It was as distinct as your voice in this room," he kept saying.

Schizophrenia was once called dementia praecox because it has a predilection for young people. Among people under 25 years, other mental diseases are negligible. Among 25 to 34-year-olds, it continues to grow in frequency, the manic-depressive psychosis also assuming importance. After the 35-year mark, general paresis and alcoholic psychoses begin to replace these two disorders, and these reach their maximum rates in the 40 to 50-year age bracket. Arteriosclerosis is the leading category among 55 to 64-year-olds; and, at seventy-five, senile psychoses are dominant.

Leaving the front wards, the visitor is shown the wards where patients with arteriosclerotic disorders and senile psychoses are kept. These diseases accounted for 12.3 per cent and 9.5 per cent, respectively, of the 1942 first admissions. There are no cubicles here and the beds are close together. The only daytime occupation of the patients is sitting on chairs around the walls of the adjoining dayroom. Many of the patients are incontinent and the visitor finds his olfactory sense a decided handicap while tripping these wards.

Some of the patients must have their hands tied to prevent their tearing clothing. Many are blind or crippled. At mealtime when they are directed to their dining room, one might see several instances of the blind supporting the lame and the lame leading the blind in reciprocation. The others form a train, each placing his hands on the preceding patient's shoulders.

In other back wards are kept the more helpless and unreliable victims of various disorders. The especially unsavory tasks connected with caring for them are done by other patients.

A considerable distance away from the other buildings are the disturbed wards. Here again the visitor is surprised to find relative decorum and to learn that most violent patients are only occasionally violent. At such times they are confined to individual cells. Less modern hospitals use mechanical restraints, however, a practice that leading psychiatrists condemn as barbarous and obsolete. By adding frustration, it develops more violent tendencies. A 1945 survey of 21 state hospita[redacted]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revealed that 18 were using mechanical restraints. One had 161 patients in camisoles daily; another had 32 patients in lock and strap daily.

The husky young attendant with whom we talk—all the attendants in the disturbed wards are big men—is unusually progressive, and reports that he has thrown away the last of the rubber hoses that had been traditionally used for disciplinary purposes in his ward. There are still attendants in mental hospitals, however, who boast that they "gave that pip six or seven good one to remember me by."

The medical wards are of little special interest to the visitor. The modern equipment here is like that of any general hospital. The proportionally large number of institution patients receiving treatment is surprising until one realizes that mental and physical health are usually closely interrelated. Mortality rates among the mentally ill are three to six times those of the general population.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

Our guest, relieved to learn that the modern mental hospital is not the house of horrors he had imagined, completes his tour blissfully unaware that even this first-rate hospital faces a desperate personnel need. In a senile and arteriosclerosis ward, for instance, he saw two attendants in charge of 80 of the most serious cases; standards approved by the American Psychiatric Association for 1945-46 call for 10 trained attendants in this type ward. One of the female buildings of the hospital lists 19 vacancies. Recreational and occupational therapy programs are virtually at a standstill for lack of trained personnel to conduct them. One mental hospital recently listed 300 vacancies on its nursing and attendant staff. A survey of 61 hospitals described in *American Journal of Psychiatry,* March, 1944, reported a United States average of 1 attendant to 124 patients.

But according to Dr. A. P. Noyes, in *Textbook of Psychiatry,* "the percentage of . . . recoveries in a mental hospital is largely in direct proportion to the individual attention received by the patients."

With a 57 hour week and wages starting at $65 a month and maintenance, the vacancies will not be filled. Add to this picture the circumstance that 2,000 conscientious objectors who have been serving as attendants at $15 a month are being released and are going home.

Even more serious than the quantitative personnel needs are the qualitative needs.

An attendant's duties are of the highest humanitarian order. Ovid noticed that "the sick mind cannot bear anything harsh." This year, Dr. Karl Menninger, Superintendent of the Topeka Veterans' Hospital, writes: "If we can love: this is the touchstone. This is the key to all the therapeutic program of the modern psychiatric hospital." And most authorities between Ovid and Menninger agree that human respect is the mental patient's proper medicine. According to Dr. C. A. Brown, Superintendent of the Danvers State Hospital (Massachusetts), "A real attendant is the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important step in the treatment of the mentally ill . . . He is the main factor in the process of recovery . . . "

For those who are to perform this high purpose, what standards and what licenses do we require? None! At the wage offered, they would be laughable. Some attendants are humble heroes of dauntless patience, performing faithful service year after year despite low compensation. But others are ne'er-do-wells who can secure employment nowhere else. Discharged for being inebriated while on ward duty, one may bladly announce his intention of "moving on to another bughouse." A publication of "The Coordinating Committee for Improving Iowa Institutions" describes mental hospital attendants' ward discipline as "at best, paternalistic; at worst, brutal and sadistic."

Attendant duty must be raised from this pitiable status to that of a profession. In the *Psychiatric Aid,* February, 1946, Dr. Robert Clark predicts that the attendant of the future will be required to pass an intensive training course, meet high personality standards, and serve a year on probationary status before being issued a certificate granting him the title and professional status of "psychiatric aide". During the probationary period he wil receive at least $100 a month, and after becoming a psychiatric aide, he will receive annual increases, sick leave, vacations with pay, old age pension and workmen's compensation. He will work no more than 45 hours a week.

The National Neuropsychiatric Institute Act (HR. 4512 and Senate 1160) now being proposed embodies a provision to train mental hospital attendants and to extend federal help to hospital budgets.

When the public is willing to pay for quality care of the mentally ill, the increased recoveries may convert the expenditure to an economy. Curing mental patients is cheaper than maintaining them indefinitely—and ever so much more decent.

The tremendous strides that have been taken in the recent history of mental patient treatment make it easy to hope that the new deal outlined by Dr. Clark is not visionary.

HISTORICAL BEGINNINGS

History holds fascinating and sometimes horrible events that evolved out of men's misconceptions of mental disease. Orientals and North American Indians treated the mentally ill with special respect on the assumption that these persons' wits were in Heaven. "Children of the Great Spirit," the Indians called them.

The scientific imagination of the Greeks led them to the brink of realizing that mental illness is subject to cause and effect. Homer noted the paradox: "If anything affects your eye you hasten to have it removed; if anything affects your mind you postpone the cure for a year." But the Romans, disregarding Greek beginnings at classifying mental diseases, initiated the term *insanity* to cover all types of serious mental illness. According to Pliney the Elder, it was property-minded lawyers who effected this leap from medical to legal terminology. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was never a clearer example of a word tyrannizing thought.

Medieval religious art depicted many scenes wherein small, horned, black-winged demons issued from the mouths of "the possessed" at the command of the healer. Later, however, the responsibility shifted from the demon within to the man who housed him and much persecution resulted. Even in early Massachusetts days, harmless old ladies were burned and—in at least one instance—pressed to death for being mentally ill.

BICETRE

The first "insane asylum" is said to have been established in Jerusalem in 491. For the succeeding 1,300 years European asylums such as the famous Bedlam were prisons and dungeons. Of the Bicêtre asylum in Paris, Mirabeau wrote: "The new inmates are heedlessly flung into this wild rabble of lunatics and any ragamuffin who comes along with a few *sous* in his pocket can be gratified by the sight of the menagerie." An interesting exception was the Quaker "House for them that are distempered and not to go to the world" founded on George Fox's advice in 1671. In 1796 the Quakers founded Tuke's Retreat, another mental institution revolutionary for its humanitarianism.

Perhaps the most stirring story in the history of man's dealings with mental disease is that of frail, retiring Dr. Philippe Penel. He abandoned his medical profession to study mental illness because a close friend had lost his reason. In the late 1700's Penel was put in charge of Bicêtre. In the face of public ridicule he converted this dungeon where 300 prisoners pounded their manacles against iron bars to a mental hospital. He began idividual diagnosis and treatment, and unchained 50 violent patients within a few days. They continued to need watchful care, but their violence subsided immediately under the therapy of his bold trust, kindness and teaching. Some were finally given complete freedom. From here on, Penel's story has a legendary ring. The most poetic account has it that Parisians mobbed the little doctor near the gates of Bicêtre for the heresy of curing and releasing the "incurable"; they were about to murder him when one of his liberated ex-patients fought his way through the mob, seized him, and fled with him to safety within the walls of Bicêtre.

Serious American reform began on the Sunday morning in March, 1841, when Dorothea Lynde Dix, a Boston school teacher, was asked to teach a Sunday School lesson in the East Cambridge House of Correction. There she found 20 women and girls crowded in a cold filthy room. There was no stove because some of the patients were violent and would have committed havoc with it.

At that time there were eight asylums in the United States, but most of the violently ill were still locked in sheds and jails. Indefatigable, charming and convincing, Miss Dix investigated jails, almshouses, and asylums and bombarded one legislature after another with blazing memorials. Typical passage:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I have myself seen more than 9,000 idiots, epileptics, and insane in United States bound with galling chains, bound beneath fetters, lacerated with ropes, scourged with rods."

Legislatures acted. In 11 states, Miss Dix received authority and funds to set up mental hospitals.

With the twentieth century came beginnings in the use of insulin, metrazol and electric shock—new hope for all types of schizophrenic patient.

A current development of importance is the surprising growth of the new National Mental Hygiene Foundation. Only an idea in the heads of a few institution attendants two years ago, the Foundation now counts Eleanor Roosevelt, Pearl Buck and Richard Walsh, and a number of leading doctors and psychiatrists among its sponsors and advisors. Its *Psychiatric Aid* is the first professional periodical aimed at the problems of institution attendants; and its documentary *Summary Statement* describing present conditions in United States mental hospitals will soon be presented to the public. "That we," the Foundation's statement of purpose begins, ". . . may speak for our afflicted brothers and present to society the story they cannot tell . . ."

Far though we have come, there remains an ugly gap between the kindly professional care we know mental patients need and the perfunctory custodial care they receive.

A tall, sharp featured, white haired old man who needed only a scythe to double for Father Time stood in the doorway of his psychopathic ward and wagged a long bony finger at me as I was leaving.

"Young man," he said, "what I need is that cow."

"What cow?"

"That cow who gives the milk of human kindness."

The cow is to be had—if we are willing to pay for her.

• A horse was seen entering a diner where he ordered a hamburger with onions.

The counterman brought him one. Then the horse ordered another hamburger. "Coming up," said the counterman.

"Now look," said the horse, "I didn't mention it the first time, but you've left off the onions again."

The customer seated next to the horse nudged his friend: "Say, see that horse eating hamburger?"

"Yeah," his friend replied, "that's the service you get nowadays . . . they'll leave off the onions every time."

• A middle-aged man rescued a small boy from the torture of teasing older children, comforted him with cookies and gave him two old tennis balls to take home. The next morning his doorbell rang and there stood the little boy beaming. He walked to the nearest table and began to take keys out of his pocket—dozens of keys to nowhere, big keys, little keys, keys on rings, keys on chains, broken keys, and junk pile keys.

"I came to tell you," he said gravely, "that if you ever need any keys I can let you have some."

—Claire MacMurray in *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "father commentator" is here to stay

Cracker Barrel Critics

By Norbert Muhlen

Radio Editor and Public Opinion Analyst

NOTWITHSTANDING the gloomy and the hopeful forecasts to the contrary, the news commentators are here to stay.

Before the end of the second world war, a special reconversion problem had bothered many radio station executives. In their belief that the recent rise and triumph of the news commentator had been a special wartime phenomenon, they searched for eventual successors with a new appeal to the post-war radio audience.

As so often happens, the experts were wrong, and the news commentators kept the preferential interest of the radio listening Americans. Several months after the end of the fighting, the commentators had lost only a very small percentage of the tremendous following they had enjoyed a year before while the Battle of the Bulge was being fought.

As long as there is high suspense in the domestic and foreign scene, people want to hear about the latest developments quickly. As long as the developments of the day bring complicated, ever-changing names, issues, contexts and dangers, people will want an expert guide who selects the most important news and explains what it means.

"I have noticed this," wrote Walter Winchell in 1937 in the defunct *Commentator* magazine, "that the people who read and hear what a reporter has to say are just as keenly interested in knowing what he thinks about folks as what he knows about them." Winchell, a former vaudeville showman and self-styled "newsboy" rather than a social psychologist, succeeded quite well in explaining the secret of the news commentator's success story. And, by applying to his own broadcasts his shrewd insight that people are "keenly interested in knowing what a reporter thinks about folks"—and, let's add, about events, trends, the world and its future, too—he also succeeded in becoming the nation's most popular radio speaker. His 15-minute program, broadcast once a week over 194 stations, is heard in about one-fifth of the nation's radio homes.

Though the day-by-day audiences of the commentators who go on the air every weekday night seem smaller than Winchell's, their actual audience and influence are greater, since people listen to them five times a week, or 75 minutes. There are about 60 regular news reporters, analysts and commentators. According to the Crossley ratings, every one of the 17 leading, commercially sponsored network newscasters has a daily average audience of almost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seven per cent of the total radio owning population.

The first one to hand out his shingle as a commentator was Hans von Kaltenborn, who began as early as 1923. This was in radio's early childhood, only two years after American broadcasting had been initiated, when a set was jokingly called an "agony box," and when a few thousand fans listened rather than today's many millions. "For a serious-minded editor intent on guiding public opinion it was a bit disconcerting to learn that so many people were not at all interested in what he said but merely in the fact that he was actually saying something in the air, from a certain station, on a certain time," Kaltenborn later reminisced, when he—by now, the dean of the commentators—still retained some of the characteristics of "the serious-minded editor" who felt a bit aloof from, and intellectually superior to, his audience.

Next to be heard over the airlanes was—in 1930 — Lowell Jackson Thomas' well-trained, pleasant voice. Other audiences had already heard Thomas, for before the first world war he had taught oratory at a Chicago college; later, he lectured to spellbound audiences on the Palestine and Arabian campaigns which he had witnessed as a sort of official war correspondent. After Thomas had made a successful debut "with motion pictures and symphony orchestras" in New York's Century Theatre, an impressario hired the whole show for an extended world tour. Thomas later lectured his way on "Romantic India."

Neither as "a serious-minded editor intent on guiding public opinion" like Kaltenborn 10 years earlier, nor as a skillful show-voice like Thomas two years before, "a man called Gabriel Heatter" came to radio in 1932 as a natural. He had been asked by a New York radio man to broadcast on a letter he had sent to the editor of a liberal weekly in which he advocated a reform of the Socialist party program. And Heatter's solemn, exhortatory voice filled the airwaves at once with such resounding glory that it remained there for the years to come.

In 1936, a new voice entered the commentators' business — that of Raymond Swing. Originally, only the British Broadcasting Company gave him time to analyze the news; the American radio directors considered his way of speaking and thinking too scholarly, highbrow and boring to draw a wider audience response.

Last of the Big Five to get into the newscasting industry was Fulton Lewis, Jr., from Washington, in 1937. He was only 34, and therefore the youngest man in the group. When they had begun news commenting, Kaltenborn had been 44; Thomas, 38; Heatter, 42, and Swing, 49. Each had come to radio over many a detour.

Each of today's big five commentators was first a newspaperman. Kaltenborn and Swing as well as Thomas started out as cub reporters and editors of Midwestern papers while Heatter had a similar start in Brooklyn. Newspaper row's merry-go-round eventually carried Kaltenborn to the position of associate editor of a Brooklyn daily, raised He[illegible]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter to that of editorial writer for sporting goods trade papers and for a house organ of steel working companies, and froze Swing for 20 years in Berlin and London as a foreign correspondent. Lewis worked in all his pre-mike years for William Randolph Hearst's publications in Washington, D. C.

Though Lowell Thomas was a "regular" newspaperman for only a short time, the number of words he wrote and published may well-nigh surpass many newspaper volumes. Out of his literary assembly line there have come about 50 books—all sorts of biographies, anthologies, histories, travel guides and juveniles. Swing and Kaltenborn have each published a few volumes of political analyses, Heatter edited his inspirational broadcasts and editorials under such titles as: *Come, Let Us Walk Together; Whom You Are Leaning On,* and, more simply: *Faith.* Only Lewis has not published a book so far.

Each of the Big Five Commentators had some college education which only Kaltenborn (Harvard) and Thomas (Princeton) completed, whereas Swing (Oberlin), and Heatter (N. Y. U.) and Lewis (University of Virginia) left before receiving their degrees.

Of these five autocrats of the nation's dinner table, two had some pre-radio teaching experience: H. V. Kaltenborn was, for a year, traveling tutor of Vincent Astor on whose [illegible]cht, cruising along the European [illegible]ast and the West Indies, he elaborated on the secrets of finance and [illegible]tics. Lowell Thomas, after [illegible]ing oratory for two years in [illegible]ago, was an instructor in Princeton's English Department for two more years.

Of these experts on the art of war who have enlightened the American people since 1939 on the real meaning of the day's battles, pincer movements and retreats, only Kaltenborn has actively participated in a war: at 20, he went to the Spanish American War as a first sargeant with the Wisconsin Voluntary Infantry. The hostilities were already closed when he finally arrived in Alabama. Of course, each of them has observed scenes of the first or the second world war in the role of reporters.

RADIO SCOOPS

In fact, Kaltenborn's most successful radio scoop was staged during the Spanish Civil War when he brought his microphone to the field of action, and so performed the notable deed of transmitting for the first time the sound of artillery and machine gun fire during actual murderous combat to the peaceful American living room. That was in 1936; one year before Gabriel Heatter had made his radio name famous over night. During Bruno Richard Hauptmann's trial for the Lindbergh kidnapping, he dramatically ad-libbed for three quarters of an hour—the last minutes of the convicted man—and so scooped his execution for 10 seconds. In 1939 Lewis made the headlines by—not quite literally—kidnapping Charles A. Lindbergh himself before his microphone where the latter delivered an impressive America-First broadcast. Thomas' ascendance proceeded quietly and steadily. Swing's way turned from relative obscurity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to radio fame during the days of Munich when the frightened, puzzled audience needed an expert guide through the war of nerves. That was the time when the commentators as a group conquered their outstanding place in the radio listeners' hearts and became a national institution.

After they became successful, they were able to concentrate on their radio commentator's jobs. Before, Kaltenborn had managed yearly tours abroad for Brooklyn's newspaper readers. Heatter had been advertising salesman for the trade papers in which he editorialized. Thomas used to do much flying and exploring. Today his engagements in newsreels and television compel him to rely on a staff of ghost writers for his daily newscasts.

There is hardly a common denominator for the personalities of these Big Five, just as there is none for their voices: Kaltenborn speaks like an elderly, worldly professor who has little sense of humour or patience with his undergraduate classes. Thomas sounds like the friendly, prosperous real estate man which he has actually become in a well-to-do community. The fan mail addressed to the "Rev. Gabriel Heatter" indicates the impression listeners get from his baritone. Lewis reminds you of the fellow in the commuters' train who gripes every night about F. D. R. and O.P.A. Swing talks like a diplomatist who explains confidential considerations of state to a fellow-attaché, even if he only repeats some editorials from, say, Moscow's yesterday morning papers.

Their voices express their personalities, the emotional slant of their news presentations, their special appeal and their own note just as their varied backgrounds do. However, though their previous newspaper work had been a good school, these men had to develop new techniques of shaping their broadcasts to the radio audience. For presenting news to the listening ear is very different from presenting it to the reading eye. Modern psychological tests and experiments have only confirmed what Charles Lamb wrote in an essay of Elia, over a hundred years ago: "A newspaper, read out, is intolerable . . . With every advantage of lungs and elocution, the effect is singularly vapid . . . "

SELECTION

With every advantage of microphone and elocution, there remained the new task of selecting a few items out of the day's stream of news. In fact, in this necessity of concentrating on a few items lies a strong element of potential bias. Even without pronouncing opinionated comments, a commentator can strongly slant his news just by reporting on some happenings, and omitting others. "He who is deficient in the art of selection may, by showing nothing but the truth, produce all the effects of the grossest falsehoods," wrote Lord Macaulay in 1828.

In a test sample of 10 consecutive days, Lowell Thomas led in numb of items, by presenting an averag of slightly more than nine differe news items per broadcast, while K tenborn and Heatter each sele approximately five, Lewis, four

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Swing, two. There seems to exist a high correlation between the number of items a newscaster presents to his audience and the popularity he enjoys from the audience as reflected in the ratings. In other words, more people turn to a good reporter who gives them a rich array of news and some personal comments, too, than to a searching analyst who allegedly shows all sides of a piece of news.

Of course, many items are duplicated and repeated in the comments of the different newscasters. When one commentator broadcasts an item which the others neglect, it is likely to be a "human-interest story" of, say, a modern Midwestern Enoch Arden which Lowell Thomas tells his rural listeners; a plea for World Government which Swing offers to his intellectual and high-income audience; a dramatic "Well, there is also a piece of good news tonight" with which Heatter peps up his middle-class listeners, so their sleep won't be troubled by too much gloom and doom; or, in Lewis' newscast, a specially played-up case of abuse in a government agency or a small branch of it to show that all is bad in Washington, D. C. One century before the nation turned to the radio commentators, Lord Macaulay wrote of certain historians: "They arrive at a theory from looking at some of the phenomena; and the remaining phenomena they strain or curtail to suit the theory."

On January 28, 1946, the first big controversial issue before the U.N. Security Council came up in London—the assembly listened to the Iranian delegate's protest against Soviet interventions in his country and the Soviet delegate's defense of his Government. Lowell Thomas summed up charges and countercharges, and concluded: "The whole thing sounds peculiar." Swing, soon thereafter, remarked somewhat sourly: "Today's discussion can't be said to have clarified the issue." Kaltenborn's analysis dissented in its opening: "The Iranians are smart boys; they are using the U.N. to get concessions from the Russians. The little nation had its opportunity." Heatter began his commentary on a note of drama: "A man representing Iran pointed to the Soviet Union"; it brought the good news that the chances for peace are five to one, and ended in a pleasant, though cautiously filmy silver lining: "Whatever happens next Wednesday—and I do not expect much—a small power can stand up against a big power . . . "

This might be called difference in judgment, or even freedom of opinion, though it may seem doubtful how much wiser the listener will be after hearing it all.

Even about as vital a fact as the national budget, different commentators will offer very different information. It may be safely assumed that very few people read the several newspaper pages on which the President's message to Congress was printed *in extenso*. If they turned on their radios, they heard first Lowell Thomas devoting seven minutes to the message, and approximately one minute to giving some figures of the budget, without commenting on it at all. Next came Lewis who spent his whole broadcast on the message, half of it on the budget. He informed his list-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eners that—after deducting the military expenses, now that the war is over—the new budget is higher than the last peacetime budget. He stressed as "the two most discouraging lines" that no tax reductions are in sight. In short, said the commentator, the budget is higher than the New Deal level: "More than 40 cents out of one dollar of the average citizen's income goes to the government — THINK *THAT* OVER." Exit Fulton Lewis, Jr., leaving his average citizen deeply worried, malcontent and angry.

SWING

To learn more, the average citizen turns his dial to Raymond Swing who follows immediately over another network. That evening, Swing was replaced by George Hicks, another newscaster who has become well-known since he described on the spot the German attack on a warship in the channel during the invasion operations of 1944. From him, our average citizen hears the joyful message that this budget contains the first cut in budgets since 1930: "I think we are going to be surprised by this President . . . He believes that democracy is a grand principle." Cheer up, average citizen, and turn to the next analyst—he'll bring more good news.

The Presidential Message, H. V. Kaltenborn began knowingly, is "a good election year document." The budget, he says, shows no further increase, but no tax reductions either. A very few figures on taxes, pensions, deficit followed—by now, the average citizen is puzzled and somewhat dizzy. So far he has learned that the budget is worse than, better than, the same as the preceding ones were—what is right? On closer analysis, it can be discovered that none of the three statements contradicted the other one, that they gave three different facets of the same facts, that they just strained or curtailed some phenomena—nothing but the truth, though—to suit the commentator's theory. Our average listener, who has learned within one hour that the budget has been increased, cut, and both of them from his three different experts turned to the last of them—Gabriel Heatter.

Heatter devoted less than three minutes to the issue of the message, and none at all to the controversial issue of the budget. His report ended in an exhortation, his news, in a sermon: "We are in a wilderness of confusion . . . We are the people of efficiency, but we are doing too many things at one time . . . What this country needs is a list of the six most immediate things to be done . . ." The citizen who has listened to the analyses of the previous two hours will whole-heartedly agree; so will one who hasn't. Neither, however, will know the essentials of the national budget for the coming year.

There are two out of three people in this country who listen three times a day to a newscast on the air; one out of three Americans even turns to radio's news presentations four times a day or more often. Farm folks average a greater amount of news listening than villagers do, and both more than city dwellers; the difference, however, is not very important. In all three of these g there are more people who tu

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a newscast at least three times a day than people who tune in less often, as a recent survey by the Katz Agency shows.

All these people rely more on the radio than on any other medium for their news. Elmo Roper's *Fortune Survey* in 1939, a nation-wide study by the defunct Office of Facts and Figures (later Office of War Information) in 1942, and finally private polls in the last years showed a continuously increasing trend toward the listeners' preference for comments on the news rather than straight news. Almost 75 per cent of the total radio population want commentators.

INFLUENCE

Whether people do listen to these daily presentations, or whether they only hear them, is a moot question which has not yet been explored sufficiently. However, the available facts caution against over-estimating their real impact on the dial twisters' mind. The seamstress who has two radio sets going all day because it makes her feel less lonely to have all the commotion around her drab working routine is rather the exaggerated rule than an exception.

A short while ago, a New York research organization questioned a sufficient sample of people who had listened to a political discussion forum of rather high standards a week earlier: "Do you happen to [redacted]member what subject was dis[redacted]sed on the program?" The in[redacted]iewees—who, incidentally, were [redacted]ely male, above 40 and in the [redacted] economic brackets—did not. [redacted]our per cent answered simply: [redacted]n't know." Of the remaining 36 per cent, none gave a right answer; many of them had only subjective recollections, such as: "It was very interesting," or "I liked it."

The test was indicative of the real influence of commentators. Many people listen to them for entertainment and from habit. Walter Winchell's audience led that of all the other radio programs for the three last July months, when many of the most popular entertainment shows of the variety, drama, quiz type were on summer vacation. The same was observed on weekday nights last August, when Gabriel Heatter drew a relatively larger audience than all the competing programs of the month. Deprived of their habitual entertainment, some listeners turned to the commentators; instead of other entertainment, many listeners habitually turn to the commentators. Maybe Gabriel Heatter gives the same satisfaction to a father which his bobby-sox daughter gets from Frank Sinatra; the Washington plots revealed by Fulton Lewis, Jr., interest many a citizen as much as the Gang Busters and The Lone Ranger captivate his son.

Even if people really listen to the commentators, they hardly recollect much of what they have been told unless it is repeated again and again as the propagandist's creed demands. In March, 1943, Princeton's Office of Public Opinion Research, headed by Professor Hadley Cantril, asked a nation-wide cross-section of the people: "Have you heard or read of a new plan announced by the President, for social security after the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war?" The question was asked shortly after the National Resources Planning Board Report had been sent to Congress. The commentators had discussed this so-called "American Beveridge Plan" intently. Forty-two per cent of the people said they knew nothing about the plan. Ten days later the question was repeated to the same cross-section of the nation which, in the meantime, had been fed with comments on Rommel's retreat in Africa, the fighting in Russia, Allied bombings of Berlin and Russian bombings of Helsinki. Now, there were 65 per cent of the nation answering that they had never heard or read of the plan.

It seems likely that extensive listening does not necessarily increase the people's awareness of facts and opinions. Psychological studies have shown that the memory lapses if forced to swallow too much.

The favorite news commentators articulate the pent-up emotions of the listener who is worried about the outside world which dangerously closes in on him. The Big Five are good spokesmen for the moods of the nation: Kaltenborn and Swing teach from their superior platform; Lowell Thomas speaks common sense; Lewis exposes the bungling and blundering bureaucrats and power-holders to the angry victims, while Heatter promises how, despite the dark day, bright vistas open in the future. Almost everybody among the audience will find some one of the commentators who speaks up for him and expresses his mood, his suspense, his fear and his hope.

A town meeting of the minds, or rather of the moods, is going on every night over the radio, and the nation listens in to the opinions, arguments, gossip, just as it watches the fighting baseball team or the kissing movie stars.

In all three instances, professionals entertain the masses by expertly doing or saying the things which the masses themselves would like to do or say, but can't. Listening to the commentators, the professionals with the voice-appeal and the grumbling or cheerful or critical disposition, is a habit; it's fun and possibly it's educational and enlightening too. Especially if one is aware of the fact that the professionals who sit and talk on the nation-wide cracker barrel every night are not necessarily experts on everything under the sun; that their natural prejudices and their personal interests easily color their presentation of the facts; in short, that commentators are people.

• Two psychologists met at breakfast.

"Good morning", said one. "You are very well. How am I?"

• An Irishman and an Englishman owned and operated small boats in a fishing village. Daily the rivalry grew more intense. One morning the Irishman awoke to find that, during the night, his rival's boat had been painted a brilliant hue and bore the name George VI. The Irishman painted his boat an even brighter color but was stumped for a name. Suddenly he seized his brush and wrote: March XVII.

—*Volta Review*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The N.T.E.A. is out for your skin

Call to Co-ops

By Miles McMillin

From his column in The Progressive

WHEN the National Tax Equality Association first began to organize and to talk big about its plans to slap down the cooperative movement, some of the old line co-ops didn't get very excited. They seemed to think that N.T.E.A. was another one of those rackets promoted by a few slick operators to make some easy money, and that as soon as the suckers had had their pockets picked, the whole thing would collapse and things would go along pretty much as before.

Some of the others, like the old line producer co-ops took the attitude that when the N.T.E.A. talked about socking the co-ops with more taxes, it wasn't looking at them. After all, they reasoned, we've been pretty chummy with business interests in recent years and certainly we can trust our friends. They seemed to think that the whole campaign was aimed at the "radical" consumer co-ops.

There has been a rude awakening in late months, however, as it has become more apparent that N.T.E.A. and the brood of organizations it has spawned are showing signs of sticking around for awhile and playing the game for keeps without any discriminnation as to who and what kind of co-ops are hit.

N.T.E.A. and its satellites are flooding the hustings with nasty propaganda. The stuff is a blanket indictment of all co-ops, insisting with brazen indifference to facts that all co-ops are entirely tax exempt. There can be no denying the fact that it has stung some of the old liners who, after first lifting their heads and yelping, "Who? Me!," have decided to do something about it. They have taken to the printing presses and are trying to make up for lost time by pouring out a flood of answers. Unfortunately their defense system is scattered, their efforts are being duplicated and in some cases running at cross purposes. They are in need of a unified command, such as the National Association of Cooperatives was set up to achieve.

The first lesson of cooperation, it seems to me, should be to learn how to cooperate. The need for unification of co-op activity has long been apparent to students of the cooperative movement. It is needed not only for marshalling defenses against such outfits as N.T.E.A. but for purposes of efficiency in normal operations.

Some encouraging developments along this line have lately come to the attention of the public. At a recent Chicago meeting a significant unification step was taken when the Co-op League of the U.S.A., National Co-ops, Inc., and the Cooper-

© 1946 by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ative Finance Association decided to merge their strength. The decision was taken after more than a year of study by a special committee. Murray D. Lincoln, long recognized as one of the most authoritative spokesmen of American co-ops, called the merger "the most important and significant step forward in strengthening and expanding the consumer purchasing cooperative movement in America that has yet been taken."

There is need for further consolidation. The co-op movement has grown like Topsy. While it lacks overall planning, organizations like N.T.E.A. quite obviously are following a well conceived pattern. Some of the "small business" groups inspired by N.T.E.A. have different names, but the program is the same.

They are not anti-co-op only. A friend of mine recently wrote asking for some material on co-ops. The signals apparently were mixed in the propaganda offices, for he received instead some vicious material on labor.

Some of N.T.E.A.'s tricks have been borrowed from the utilities, who are kicking in to the campaign. Not long ago it was disclosed that N.T.E.A. had invaded the schools. A cash prize contest had been announced for students writing the best essays on the co-op tax question. Just to make it safe, prizes were also offered to the supervising teachers. A panel of college professors are to judge the merits of the essays.

When this brazen propaganda stunt was exposed and friends of the co-ops began to recall similar tricks pulled by the old Insull crowd, one of the judges on the panel resigned.

There are other curious things about the propaganda campaign being promoted by the so-called "small business" groups. For one thing advertising has been placed in the *Wall Street Journal,* making an appeal to other "small businessmen" to join up and kick in some supporting funds. If you want to know what kind of fakery that is, just trot up and down the main street of your home town and find out how many of the genuine small business men in your community take the *Wall Street Journal.*

One of the tear-jerkers ground out by the anti-co-op crowd is how Uncle Sam is being denied his share of money by tax exemption of co-op patronage dividends. One would think that the Treasury Department is already to cave in on Secretary Vinson to hear or read the loud wailing about this item. The fact is no one knows how much would be coming into the government if the exemptions were lifted. One thing is certain and that is that the co-ops could easily get around it by cutting prices rather than giving rebates.

The ironical thing about it is that business, if successful, will force a bitter price war, something they have striven mightily to avoid in the past.

• "If you talk well but still can't convince, you ain't got nuthin."
—*Chester Bowles*

(Money does all the talking these days, Chester.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Elocution is no more

The Lost Art

From "Topics of The Times" in The New York Times

WE suppose that in most dictionaries it will soon be marked obsolete, this old-fashioned word "elocution" with which John T. Winterich, managing editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature,* brought back a rush of nostalgic memories in an editorial the other day.

He was telling how Matthew Arnold came to America to lecture in 1883, bringing with him a delivery so feeble that an Andover Professor of Elocution had to be called to the rescue. Two brief lessons sufficed to change the visitor from a failure to a success. An audience of 3,500 in the Brooklyn Academy of Music could hear him in all parts of the house.

We are accustomed today to a rather tame approach in public speaking, for which perhaps the radio may be blamed. Oratory now is only the voice, and that carefully restrained. The other dimensions are gone.

At the time of Arnold's lecture tour the full flavor of elocution at its best was exemplified. "Practical Elocution," by J. W. Shoemaker, A. M., first entered in the office of the Librarian of Congress in 1880, but is still miraculously around, in 1913, in an enlarged edition issued by the Penn Publishing Company of Philadelphia.

Mr. Shoemaker, who was president of the National School of Elocution and Oratory, took a broad view of his duties to the student of elocution. He saw the whole man, body and spirit, as his responsibility. Elocution "concerns the commerce of the mind and soul." It calls into play "the most vital organs of the human body," brings into vigorous action the intercostal muscles, and gives a natural stimulant to the circulation, "so that the organs of digestion and the entire physical system participate in the benefit."

Some gymnastic exercises were desirable, naturally, to develop the necessary physique for the well-rounded elocutionist. One of these embraced considerable variety, including hands, drumbeat, claps, body, head, dumb-bells, clubs, twisted thrusts, touching floor with hands, and swaying, swinging arms. The latter went something like this: Stamp left foot, then right; then charge diagonally forward with right; bend and straighten right knee; at same time throwing arms back from horizontal in front.

A suitable voice depends, of course, on proper breathing and "imparts force and dignity to every relation of life." Exercises would include chest breathing, costal

© 1946 by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

breathing, waist, dorsal and abdominal breathing, as well as full, prolonged, effusive, expulsive and explosive breathing, the latter being achieved by taking a full breath, to be expelled suddenly and with force in a whispered but somewhat terrifying utterance of the word Ha! A warning note from the author mercifully advised that the exercises be "discontinued if any sensation of dizziness is experienced."

It was in the gesture, however, that elocution attained its greatest glory. Merely by The Hand Vertical, for instance, the artist could convey "abhorrence of an object which is distasteful, disgusting or terrible." But the hand vertical was versatile. It could also be used in surprise, and to deplore an unavoidable calamity.

If you were going to declaim "lie lightly on him earth," both hands would be prone; or, "pray you, tread softly," one hand prone; or, "with united hearts let us drive back the invaders," both hands vertical; or "blessed mother, save my brain," one hand on head; or, "be still, sad heart! and cease repining," hand you know where.

The soul of the speaker must bear record on the emotions he wishes to convey. The nose and upper lip would be elevated to show scorn; the lips would be parted in "secresy," surprise and fear.

A good, wholesome vocal exercise for a warm-up would be "Co, boss! Co, boss! Co! Co! Co!" A tendency among some teachers to obtain sound without much reference to sense was justly deplored. A good thing to commit to memory was "What whim led White Whitney to whittle, whistle, whisper, and whimper near the wharf, where a floundering whale might wheel and whirl."

The moral principle was near the heart of this dear, dead elocution of the old days. "Pure, chaste conversation is at once the highest oratory."

Alas! we have now with us an underprivileged generation of children to whom the very word is a stranger. "There is no 'elocution' entry in the (classified) telephone books of today," says Mr. Winterich sadly, in lamenting the decline in the art of the spoken word. Our elocution teachers are now instructors of public speaking; the drama, the oratory, the eloquence have gone out of it. It is all pedestrian.

• George Bernard Shaw was having lunch in a London restaurant when an orchestra struck up a particularly noisy tune. As the noise continued, Shaw called the head waiter and asked:

"Does the orchestra play anything on request?"

"Yes, sir", the man replied. "Is there something you would like them to play?"

"There is", Shaw replied. "Ask them to play dominoes until I have finished eating."

• Residents of Timnath, Colorado, population—860, will regain their local vote in a forthcoming election, the first since 1936. Mayor Robert H. Watts said there had been no elections because no one thought to mention the matter. (We call it the "Roosevelt" coma.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Four Power Pact proposal was a master stroke

Byrnes Scores

By Anne O'Hare McCormick

From her column "Abroad" in The New York Times

SECRETARY Byrnes has brought the million-dollar question into the open. Is security the primary aim of Russian policy? Every move around the vast periphery of the Red empire, from Manchuria and Korea to Iran and from the Mediterranean through eastern Europe to the Baltic, is explained as a necessary step toward surrounding the Soviet Union with friendly neighbors. Russia argues that she must enlarge her sphere of influence to insure herself against a recrudescent militarism in Germany and Japan, or (to the Russian people) against "capitalist encirclement." France demands a new regime in the Rhineland and the Ruhr as a protection against future German aggression.

All right, says Mr. Brynes; let's dispose of these fears by signing a four-power treaty of alliance binding all of us for 25 years, or longer, to keep Germany disarmed. Then we can proceed to make a European peace on the assumption that that danger is eliminated. Likewise, he added in effect, we can start from the premise that the United States is in Europe to stay.

This is a direct challenge to the peacemakers. It strengthens the reputation the Secretary of State is acquiring for taking the initiative in international policy. First he insists that the Foreign Ministers must get together and work on the draft treaties without further delay. Then, when they are assembled, he loses no time in laying on the table, and publishing to the world, a definite and, as far as the United States is concerned, a revolutionary proposal for a military alliance designed to lay the German specter for a generation and all the excuses for unilateral action that hide behind it.

The most interesting aspect of the Brynes proposal is that it is not new. One good reason for including Senator Vandenberg in the Paris delegation is that he sponsored a similar treaty in January, 1945. But his statement at that time, important as it is in promising Republican support for a drastic departure from our traditional policy, was not an official declaration and is not so significant as the fact that Mr. Byrnes discussed the treaty with Stalin in Moscow last December and that the text has been in the hands of all the governments concerned since early February.

This throws light on much that has happened since. Washington began to take a strong line toward Russia only after this offer had been received in Moscow. Before the Security Council met in New York, before the Russians moved to sew up the economic monopolies in the

© 1946 by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

border states that worry this government because they mortgage the settlements, the Soviet Government knew that the United States was ready to enter a pact to protect Russia's frontiers from any possible German aggression. This renders pretty silly the current talk that Russia's policy is based on doubts of our intentions, fears of an Anglo-American bloc against her or suspicions of a plot to build up German military power. Since the American proposal was first circulated, there is no excuse for this mistrust.

There will be less excuse now that the offer is publicized. It was a master stroke of diplomacy on the part of Mr. Brynes to tell the world about the proposal at the moment he asked to have it placed on the agenda the the conference. If the United States is willing to sign such a agreement, nations whose security is more directly menaced by the German war potential cannot well refuse. While it was a secret, they might ignore it or postpone action, but in public they have to say or do something.

The proposal is more than a bold move to make our position clear and allay fears and suspicions invoked to justify selfish policies. It recognizes that the German problem has to be dealt with in any realistic approach to a European settlement. The question of the Ruhr cannot be intelligently discussed until the powers responsible for the peace agree on a plan to keep peace in Germany. A quadripartite control of German disarmament, offering France the guarantee she was refused after the First World War, is bound to influence the French attitude on the boundary question. It is bound to influence the attitude of all European states toward every other decision.

The disintegration of Europe is the greatest single cause of anxiety to the makers of our foreign policy. They are gravely disturbed by conditions in Germany and their spreading repercussions. Mr. Brynes' proposal is the product of this anxiety. It is advanced as an alternative to the division of Europe, for it is already clear that partition is a prescription for ruin and perpetual conflict. A long-term guard over Germany would hold the Big Four together, it is hoped, and create confidence in their cooperation, on which peace depends.

The proposed treaty would work for the advantage of Germany also. A strict and continuous supervision backed by force to maintain complete demilitarization would be the most practical method to reduce the occupying armies, shorten the occupation and thereby break up the zone system which is blocking and hardening the arteries not only of Germany but of the whole Continent. A Germany militarily impotent and economically self-supporting is the best hope of order in Europe, and it is because this has become the objective of American policy that the American delegation has offered a solution which Washington believes would make the German problem manageable.

● "Sins Sheikspiers taim dher haz bien ei greiter poltereishun in dhu Inglish languij dhan ai am propouzing nau"—Mont Follick, speaker of 14 languages, urging the use of "automatic English." (But we had three hundred years to get used to it.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The G.O.P. hopes to win "by default"

By Default

By Malcolm W. Bingay

From his column "Good Morning" in the Detroit Free Press

THE word "obsession" is very old. In modern usage it means "the persistent and disturbing intrusion of, or anxious and inescapable preoccupation with, an idea or an emotion."

Originally it meant "an act of the devil or some other evil spirit in besetting a person and compelling him to action." In medieval times these evil spirits had to be exercised from the system of the victim. In modern psychiatry the victim of such turmoil is looked upon as one having the fixation of an idea.

It is one of the easiest ways to go nutty.

Well in my travels around the United States this Spring, from coast to coast and after talking to many people, I have a hunch that that is what is wrong with the Republican Party.

The leaders of it have been seized with an obsession and cannot escape from it. Their *bête noire* is Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yes, he's dead, but you cannot make these old gentlemen realize it. They still talk of him as though, subconsciously, they believe that he is to be a candidate again in 1948.

This party neurosis is one of the most significant phenomena of our times. The very name of "that man" blurs all sense of reality when an old-line Republican begins to talk politics.

The high priest of the cult—self-appointed, but completely accepted—is Westbrook Pegler. Every day in every way he parades the awful things the late President did to this country. And the Old Guardsters read him and glow with an unholy light. "That's telling him," they gloat. They act as though the late Mr. Roosevelt were some sort of a political werewolf who will spring from his grave any minute now and start walking the face of the earth again. Got to drive a stake into his heart!

Some of them talk as though they actually regretted his passing because they wanted the pleasure of seeing him go down to defeat in 1948. That is understandable. They hated him so hard they can't quit.

What they fail to understand is that Roosevelt represented no party. He was a personality with a political genius in holding together a strange heterogeneous group of warring factions to serve his purposes. That cohesion of warring forces died with him. Today there is actually no such thing as a Democratic Party any more than there is a Republican Party. They are both dead—without ideas and without ideals.

But because there are no other parties in the offing, no machinery for coherent organization of rival forces based on differing policies,

© 1946 by the Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these two old and broken political mechanisms will totter into line for the 1948 campaign.

Since he took office Harry Truman has shown no capacity for leadership. He offers no suggestions for policy except those handed to him by quarreling elements within his own group and each one seems to contradict the other.

Against this the Republicans offer nothing but opposition to whatever is attempted, whether it is right or wrong. The whole refrain in their symphony of negation is hatred of Roosevelt.

Up to the moment of this writing the party leaders have offered nothing in the way of a new and constructive program of action to maintain the welfare of this nation. The gentlemen who wear G.O.P. buttons seems to feel that they will win the next election by default and do not need any program.

That is what worries me.

If the hopes of the G.O.P. remnants are well founded and we have a so-called Republican Party back in power after 1948, what kind of a party will it be?

The Republican Party won the 1920 election by default. So sure was the Old Guard of victory that it put up Warren G. Harding. Little Mr. Coolidge won on his "prosperity," which every economist knew was a credit expansion and not real prosperity at all. Hoover had to take the rebound when the balloon burst.

So Roosevelt took over by default. A Chinese laundryman, running on his laundry ticket, could have beaten Hoover. And in 1936 that same Chinaman could have beaten Alf Landon without even his laundry ticket. Wendell Willkie tried to inject life into the old elephant but failed and, last time, Tom Dewey hoped to win by promising more cock-eyed legislation than Roosevelt ever dreamed of.

Now the war is over and we are drifting into what Grover Cleveland called innocuous desuetude. I do not think it possible for the G.O.P. leaders to rise to such heights of stupidity that they can lose in 1948—not even with prosperity back.

So, what are we going to get?

Do we merely toss out the old skeletons of one dead party to put the old bones of another dead party back into office?

Or, will there rise amongst us young men of vision who are willing to speak their minds and hearts and souls and proclaim a program?

• A man went into a Broadway bar to order two jiggers of Scotch. The bartender gave them to him. The man drank one and poured the other into his vest pocket.

The bartender was overcome by curiosity. "Look, bub, there's just one thing I'd like to know. Why do you drink one and pour the other into your pocket?"

The customer bristling with indignation said: "I wish you'd mind your own business."

A little mouse popped out of his vest pocket and said, "That goes for your cat too."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia and Britain are at it again

The Same Old Story

By Paul Scott Mowrer

From his column in The New York Post

THE present tension between Russia and Britain is a new chapter in an old story.

One of my earliest literary recollections is of reading a tale by Kipling called "The Man Who Was." It told of a British soldier who returned to his old regiment in India, an unrecognizable human wreck after years of imprisonment in a Russian horror camp.

Russia and Britain were rivals then, and have been since, for the exertion of dominant influence in Afghanistan and all the wild regions bordering northern India and southern Russia.

In about 1911, when I first became interested in international affairs, one curious situation that came to my notice was in Iran, then called Persia. The Russians had a zone influence in the north and the British in the south. Only the central part seemed to belong truly to the Persians.

Ever since Russia has bordered the Black Sea it has desired to pass freely in peace and war through the Dardanelles and Mediterranean. Does anyone doubt that the British or American people would feel any different in the same circumstances?

Some people seem to have been surprised and shocked by the Russian claim to the trusteeship over Libya. In 1776 when Britain needed foreign troops for use in its rebellious American colonies, its first choice was Russians—not Hessians. Russia agreed to lend the troops if Britain would cede it the Balearic Islands, then under British rule. Rather than let the Russians into the Mediterranean, Britain went shopping elsewhere.

In the last war Russia seemed at last about to realize its ancient ambition. When Turkey joined in on the German side, Britain and France were persuaded to promise the Dardanelles to Russia. A secret treaty was signed. But Russia was defeated. The German general staff cunningly arranged transportation for the Bolshevik revolutionary leaders from exile in Switzerland back to Russia, where they seized power and to some extent began to play the German game. The Allies thereupon considered themselves freed from the promise about the Dardanelles. Every Russian remembers that.

People forget what vast territories were lopped from helpless Russia after the last war. It lost far more territory than Germany. It lost Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bessarabia. It lost Kars and Ardahan. The British only withdrew from the Caucasus under

© 1946 by The New York Post Corporation, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threat of force. Russia also very nearly lost Siberia.

Russia was and is an empire. Its colonies, instead of lying overseas, lie among its borders. I am not discussing now the right or wrong of the frontiers imposed on Russia after the last war. I wish merely to recall the extent of Russia's losses.

In the light of present events, it is interesting to remember another episode that occurred after the last war. The United States was offered a mandate over Armenia. If we had accepted, future Russian expansion into the Near East would have been impossible without running afoul of America. We did not accept.

I traveled extensively after the last war in Slav countries. In Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and even Poland, it was the opinion of thoughtful Slavs that Britain had fixed a policy of trying to shut off all Slavs from access to the seas. True or not, it is significant that the Slavs believed this.

Behind the mistaken politics that resulted in so much foreign help being given to Germany after the last war, there was certainly the idea that Germany might serve as a counterpoise, not merely to France, which was no danger, but to Russia which might become a danger.

Today Russian armies are on the Elbe. But in 1815 there were Russian troops in Paris. Today Russia is reaching out into the northern Pacific. But time was when there were Russian garrisons not only in Alaska but also in California.

Just as Napoleon felt insecure in his European system unless he could finally subdue and include Russia, so today some Communists may feel their own European system will remain insecure unless France also becomes a Soviet Socialist republic. The immediate future of Russian expansion may well be decided in the coming elections in France.

I cannot pretend to read the future, but I am among those who do not believe we are going to have to fight Russia. I don't think there will be war with Russia. I still believe that if we take the trouble to understand the background of Anglo-Russian rivalry and of Russia's claims, and if we Americans are careful to make justice instead of expediency our only principle, we can come to terms with Russia.

• Statistician: a man who draws a mathematically precise line from an unwarranted assumption to a foregone conclusion.
Professor: a man whose job it is to tell students how to solve the problems of life which he himself has tried to avoid by becoming a professor.
Optimist: a man who thinks the future is uncertain.
Pessimist: a man who is afraid the optimist is right.
Economist: a man who can make a simple subject complex, a complex subject simple; in other words, an economist is simply simple.
Consultant: a man who knows less about your business than you do and gets paid more for telling you how to run it than you could possibly make out of it even if you ran it right instead of the way he told you.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seed

Each has design.
Man dies his death:
No columbine
Catches its breath.
But, alike of each,
Seed goes on:
Stamens reach,
Man has his son,
Save when some plan
Of drouth or war
Leave fewer than
There were before.
Then soon again
New dews revive
Flowers and men
To come alive.

—*WITTER BYNNER*

Now in this Season

The heart, no longer sick of an old sorrow,
No longer, now, nostalgic of a land
Lovely and sterile that had borned no morrow,
Faces the east again, takes up its stand
On meadows of the new, the virginal
Unmemoried spring of ignorant delight,
That has no history and cannot recall
A similar morning or a different night.
The bird that skims the field and seeks the wood,
And sings to heaven of the current day,
Knowing this day is hers and very good,
Is metaphor and meaning . . . Let us pray
The heart, no longer sick, be such a one,
That has no memory, now—and shall have none.

—*DAVID MORTON*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM: SHOULD PALESTINE

YES: THE ZIONIST CASE

By Marie Syrkin

Associate Editor of the *Jewish Frontier*

THEORETICAL discussions of Zionism are beside the point. Jewish survivors of the Nazi holocaust would find such questions as, "Are the Jews a people?", malevolent as well as unreal. The Jews of Europe believe that the answer has been given forever in the gas-chambers of Oswiecim. They are convinced that six million Jews were murdered not only because they were the members of a proscribed race, but because they belonged to a people with no land of its own.

The national homelessness of the Jewish people is, of course, not the sole explanation for Hitler's extermination-plan, but it is very largely the secret of its success. Throughout the Hitler decade the world was witness to the monstrous spectacle of human beings fleeing for their lives and finding tightly-barred doors. Only the Jews of Palestine offered welcome and sanctuary. The fires burning in the incinerators of Maidonek and Treblinka served to high-light the anomaly of the Jewish situation: that Jews, though martyred and persecuted as a people, have none of the privileges and defenses available even to the smallest and most backward peoples. They have no territory of their own which they can seek out as of right and not as of sufferance. No matter how happy the lot of an individual Jew may be, the status of Jews as a group is abnormal.

Zionism antedates Hitler. The dream of the return to Zion goes back to the destruction of the Temple, nearly two thousand years ago. However, the Nazi slaughter-house has given the signal that the time is up. The world can no longer wait—neither for decades nor for years—for a fundamental solution of the Jewish problem. The question is on the immediate agenda.

The justice of the Zionist claim was recognized by the Balfour Declaration. The events of the intervening years have merely served to emphasize the validity of the Zionist case in every particular. The necessity for a Jewish homeland has proven to be greater than the blackest pessimists had feared, and the achievements of Jewish colonization in Palestine have been more brilliant than the cheeriest optimists had hoped.

A large proportion of the million and a half Jews remaining alive in Europe must emigrate. Their position is untenable. In Poland, in Germany, in the Balkans, Nazi propaganda has left a legacy of virulent anti-Semitism which the defeat of the Axis has not automatically erased. Hundreds of Jews who returned to their former homes in Poland have been murdered by fascist hooligans since the liberation. In Vienna, an audience watching a ball-game in which a Jewish team took part, raised the cry "Into the gas

(Continued on page 914)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COME THE JEWISH HOMELAND?
NO: THE ARAB CASE

By Khalil Totah
Executive Director of the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, Inc.

IT is essential, at the outset, to introduce the Arabs to American readers in order to remove the widespread misconception that they are all nomads and dwellers of the desert. It is important to disassociate them from life either in a tent or on the back of a camel. As a matter of fact, there are only about 60,000 bedouins in Palestine while a million and a quarter Arabs live in cities and villages. These people carry on modern business and till the soil. They have their own banks, chambers of commerce, industrial plants and produce the best oranges in the world. It is safe to state that more Arabs in Palestine ride in American-made cars than on camels. Arab leaders are not shieks but graduates of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Oxford, Cambridge, the Sorbonne and the American universities of Beirut and Cairo. These men have been brought up on the principles of the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence as well as on modern laboratory technique and up-to-date scientific thinking. Nor is it a novel experience for Arab minds to wrestle with mathematics, practice medicine, chart the heavens and administer government: for they descend from ancestors who delivered Europe from the cumbersome system of Roman notation and presented it with the simple and practical Arabic numerals. The zero is an Arab contribution to the science of numbers, so is algebra. Medicine was taught in Arabic text books in the universities of Louvain and Montpelier as late as the seventeenth century. The Arab Empire extended from the confines of India to the shores of the Atlantic and the Pyrenees. Such leadership, therefore, is far from being feudal and reactionary.

Any attempt by the Zionists, therefore, to belittle Arab achievement, to make slurs on Arab integrity, to paint Arabs in dark colors and to minimize Arab potentialities, must be dismissed as malicious slander. Palestine Arabs, with the rest of the Arab world, are experiencing a renaissance and are intoxicated with the new spirit of progress. The Arabs desire to march shoulder to shoulder with the new forces of democracy and are eager to contribute anew to human well-being and prosperity. It is only against this background the Arab struggle against Zionism can be thoroughly understood.

Palestine is an Arab country. This simple statement is based not on sentimental argumests, fantastic hypotheses, conflicting pledges or dubious claims; but on hard, incontestable facts for everyone to behold.

Palestine is Arab, because it is now inhabited by Arabs who are very much there. Their presence in Palestine does not rest on declarations, mandates, pledges, White papers or papers of any other color. The obvious fact that they are there in full possession gives them every right to owne nip.

(Continued on page 918)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 912)

with them," when some dispute arose between the players. It is not astonishing, therefore, that Jews are seeking the shelter of the American Zone in Germany, and are demanding the right to settle in Palestine. There are, of course, Jewish survivers in France, in Holland or Belgium who will re-integrate themselves into their native lands, but the majority of the Jews of Eastern Europe cannot rebuild their shattered lives on soil drenched with the blood of their parents and children and in an air poisoned with hate.

PALESTINE IS HOME

A place exists to meet their need. It is the land pledged by solemn international commitments and rebuilt by Jewish labor. Jews do not capriciously clamor for a non-existent territory; nor have they arbitrarily chosen some Eastern paradise which they seek to invade. They wish to return to the country of their fathers—the land of Israel hallowed in their prayers since the dispersion. They do not demand a rich and fertile country. They ask for the swamps, the deserts, the denuded hills of Palestine, grown waste through the centuries of neglect. They seek to continue the miracle of reclamation which a generation of Jewish pioneers has already achieved by its toil.

That the Jewish people needs Palestine, and that Palestine needs the Jewish people have been demonstrated by contemporary history. In recognition of this bond, the Balfour Declaration was made the official policy of 52 nations when the Council of the League of Nations unanimously ratified the British Mandate with the Balfour Declaration incorporated. The United States has gone on record in favor of a Jewish National Home through congressional resolutions. Why then should the Zionist case still have to be argued? Because the Arabs object. They claim that the sufferings of the Jewish people are not an Arab responsibility, that Palestine is an Arab country and that no pledges made by the British or other nations can alter that fact.

ANALYSIS OF ARAB CLAIMS

It would be wholly inaccurate to assume that the statesmen who were responsible for the issuance of the Balfour Declaration overlooked the trifling circumstances that Palestine had a native population. President Wilson, Lloyd George, Lord Balfour and Winston Churchill were well aware of the presence of 600,000 local Arabs. But the underlying assumption of the Declaration was that while over 97 per cent of the huge Arab territories liberated by the Allies in World War I would be devoted to the setting up of independent Arab states, the "small notch" of Palestine was to be reserved for the creation of a Jewish State. Even the "small notch" envisaged by the Balfour Declaration was considerably whittled away. In 1922, Transjordan, originally a part of Palestine and an area two and a half times the size of cis-Jordan (the land west of the Jordan) was cut away from the Jewish National Home, reducing its size by approximately two-thirds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, the promises made by the British to the Arabs were kept with good measure. In the lands of Asia freed by the Allies from Turkish rule, five independent Arab states have been set up: Saudi-Arabia, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan. This enormous, under-populated, undeveloped area covers over 1,200,000 square miles. Western Palestine constitutes less than one per cent of the total area.

One should also bear in mind that the Balfour Declaration was not thrust upon an unwitting and unwilling Arab world. Emir Feisal, the chief Arab spokesman at the Peace Conference in 1919, concluded an agreement with Dr. Weizmann in which Feisal stated that, "The Arab State and Palestine in all their relations and undertakings shall be controlled by the most cordial good will and to this end Arab and Jewish duly accredited agents shall be established and maintained in their respective territories." As is clear from the context, Feisal thought of the union of the Arabs in one state, and of Palestine, in the remaining three per cent, as a Jewish state.

So much for the history of the respective pledges and covenants. As has been indicated, it was the Jews who rapidly got the worst of the bargain, losing two-thirds of the promised territory at one cut.

The Balfour Declaration also specified that nothing be done which might "prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." It is therefore pertinent to ask what has been the fate of the original 600,000 Arabs who were in Palestine in 1917.

FATE OF PALESTINIAN ARAB

What has been the effect of Jewish settlement on the Arabs of Palestine? Were the Arabs "driven out" of their homes? Were they displaced to make room for the newcomers? On the contrary. There are now over a million Arabs in Palestine. The Arab community has nearly doubled in size. Compare this increase with the situation in Transjordan which was lopped off from Palestine and closed to Jewish immigration. There the population, though also under a British mandate, has remained static.

The tremendous increase of the Palestine Arab is due to two causes: first, the immigration of Arabs from neighboring countries attracted by the higher wages and standard of living in Palestine. *Since the Balfour Declaration, Palestine has changed from a country of Arab emigration into one of Arab immigration.* This phenomenon cannot be observed in any of the adjacent Arab lands. The second, and major cause of the Arab increase is the improvement in health conditions due to Jewish medical services and sanitation. Paradoxically enough, the supposedly "dispossessed" Palestinian Arabs have the highest rate of natural increase in the world. The high Arab birth rate is no longer counter-balanced by a high death-rate among infants and adults. A comparison of the vital statistics of Palestinian Arabs, and the Arabs of any of the Arab States is extremely instructive.

Population statistics show the absurdity of the charge that Arabs have been "driven out" by Jewish colonization. There is still another question which may legitimately be asked. How have the Arabs of Palestine fared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economically? Have they been exploited or impoverished? Again figures are instructive. The Arabs of Palestine get far higher wages and work far fewer hours than their cousins in the independent Arab states. It is the fellahs of Egypt and Iraq and Saudi-Arabia who are the classic examples of the exploited, backward masses. The progress of Palestine due to Jewish labor, initiative and capital has benefited the Arab as well as the Jew. In the face of incontestable evidence, only the most irresponsible propagandist will allege that Zionism has injured the Arab economically.

In view of the increased material and physical well-being of the Palestinian Arabs as the direct result of Jewish colonization, why do they so obstinately refuse to acknowledge these blessings? This is an obvious question, and the answer is equally obvious. The Arabs of Palestine want complete political sovereignty. They fear that unchecked Jewish immigration will create a Jewish majority. They want Palestine to become an Arab state, just as the Zionists demand the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration through the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth. The Arabs of Palestine wave aside the calculations which indicate that only one per cent of the Arab lands has been reserved for the Jewish people. They want that one per cent also regardless of any existing international covenants and needs. In other words, no matter how much they may prosper as individuals and how scrupulously their civil and political rights may be respected, they view Zionism as an attack upon their national prerogatives.

ARAB NATIONALISM

Jews would be the last to question the importance of national independence. Arab nationalism is a genuine force and it would be idle to minimize it. It is a powerful factor in the resurgence of the Middle East. But "Palestinian" Arab nationalism is a product of very recent vintage. When the Mandate was granted, the territory now designated as Palestine was for its Arab inhabitants merely "the south of Syria." It was a geographical locality, not a national or political entity as far as the Arabs were concerned. The

OUR ROSTRUM

FORUM announces the return, in the August issue, of "Our Rostrum"—a popular sounding board of reader opinion.

FORUM is *your* magazine of opinion. Our regular features present authoritative but divergent views on the issues of the moment. For complete coverage, however, we need your criticism and comment.

"Our Rostrum" is *your* platform. You are invited to submit letters on any of the issues discussed in this magazine. The best letters will be printed in this column each month. As in the past, the editor must reserve the right to publish letters in part because of space limitations.

Letters for the August issue should reach us by July first.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arab nationalists of the period objected to the creation of "Palestine" on the grounds that it was a part of Syria. The reconstruction of the ancient land of Israel into a modern Palestine was done to meet the express national need of the Jewish people. Arab nationalism was to find its outlet in the huge underpopulated territories liberated by the Allies. There is, therefore, no specific "Palestinian-Arab" nationalism which is being violated by the possibility of an eventual Jewish majority in Palestine.

That this is as true to-day as it was at the end of World War I can be gathered from the recent proposal of the Arab League at the meeting of its Council in Cairo. It was there moved that a common nationality and citizenship be enjoyed by all the citizens of the Arab States. Commenting on this proposal the *Times* correspondent (*The New York Times,* April 14) wrote: "Outsiders observe that there is naturally a free interchange of populations between the Arab States and a minimum of national consciousness, especially as several of the Arab States are simply political creations of World War I. It is not uncommon to find a citizen of one Arab State serving in the government of another."

The Arabs of Palestine and their champions in the Arab States would have just cause for complaint if they had been "dispossessed" from their homes, or if their civil and religious rights were endangered or disregarded. Their case however, rests itself solely on the demand for Arab national domination of Palestine as well as of the other 99 per cent of the former Turkish lands. This desire, though understandable, does not hold water when weighed against the need for the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.

JEWISH NEED

The Jews are a minority everywhere. We have seen to what the national homelessness of the Jewish people has led. There is only one place where the Jews can live and re-live as a people. It is the land to which they the bound by history, whose wastes they have fructified with their blood, sweat, and exuberant courage, and which has been promised them by international covenants. The Arab lands are under-populated and desperately in need of man-power. Arab nationalism has more than ample scope for its development in any of the Arab States which now proposes a common citizenship. The tiny strip of Palestine is not essential to the welfare or renaissance of the Arab people, but it is a matter of life-and-death in the most literal sense to the Jewish people.

Many national problems are being radically solved in the post-war world. Boundaries are being altered and populations shifted with small regard for the preferences and comforts of the individuals involved. The issues are presumably decided by considerations of international peace and equity. A fundamental solution of the Jewish question is simpler and involves fewer honest difficulties than most of the changes being made. Here is a people which begs fanatically for the privilege of transforming uninhabited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and uninhabitable deserts and swamps into flourishing cities and booming settlements. The city of Tel Aviv with its 100,000 inhabitants was built on sand—again in the literal not metaphoric sense. Twenty years ago the Valley of the Emek with its green fields and cooperative farms was a malaria-ridden swamp. That is how the Jewish pioneers have been creating absorptive capacity in Palestine—not by driving out the native population but by making new room through the most daring and imaginative soil reclamation projects ever attempted. Young Jewish pioneers are even washing the sultry shores of the Dead Sea free of salt. Rose gardens and banana groves are now growing on soil which had been the symbol of barrenness since antiquity. And this wonder of redemption has been achieved not through the exploitation of "natives" but through the self-sacrificial toil of the settlers themselves. What reason is there in throttling such creativeness?

A land stagnant for centuries has been re-awakened. The Jordan has been harnessed for electric power. New projects like the Lowdermilk Plan which would open up immense further possibilities for irrigation and the generation of hydro-electric power have been formulated. Liberal political and social concepts have been introduced into the semi-feudal Middle East. Jews have created an oasis—socially as well as physically—in the torpid wastes of the desert.

FORCES OF DEMOCRACY SHORT-SIGHTED

The forces of democracy can only be the gainers through the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. Of course, in a world which continues to be dominated by the machinations of the oil-interests, by the play for strategic bases and points of military vantage, it is no doubt idle to speak in terms of human need, national justice and international morality. But even in the suicidal world of power-politics—now courting the catastrophe of atomic warfare—the readiness to sacrifice the rights of the Jewish people in order to curry favor with Ibn Saud or the Grand Mufti is short-sighted. The United Nations found the Arab rulers weak reeds to lean upon in the struggle with the Axis. They will not prove more zealous in any future struggle.

Those who think in terms of a just and stable democratic world order know that the ancient wrong to the Jewish people must at last be righted. This can only be done through the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth of which Arab and Jew alike will be full-fledged and prosperous citizens. Those who are concerned with the progress and enlightment, not the subjugation, of the Middle East, should be its chief advocates.

(Continued from page 913)

The Arabs are not only in present possession of Palestine, but they have been enjoying full possession for centuries without interruption. Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments and empires have come and gone, but the native inhabitants of the Holy Land have persisted and survived endless conquests and upheavals. The present Arab population of Palestine does not only begin with the Arab conquest over 13 centuries ago but antedates that conquest. When the Zionists make claims on Palestine on grounds of historic connection, they seem to ignore the longer historic connection of the Arabs with the soil of the Holy Land. During these centuries, the Arabs have made Palestine their home. They have built their cities and villages, erected their sanctuaries, tilled their soil and carried on their legitimate business. In a word, they have been in full exercise of every vestige of moral, historical and legal ownership.

Palestine, moreover, is Arab in speech, tradition, folk lore and culture. About one-tenth of the population is Christian Arab—a worthy people who trace their Christianity to the days of St. Paul. It is a Holy Land to these Christian Arabs as well as to several million Christian Arabs in Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Egypt and Iraq.

Besides continuous possession and long occupation, the Arabs claim title to Palestine on the basis of their numbers. It may be of interest to note that when the British promised Palestine to the Jews, nine-tenths of its inhabitants were Arabs and only one-tenth Jews. Furthermore, the British gave it away before it was their own. Today, after 25 years of the most ruthless efforts of the Zionists backed by British might to pack Palestine with immigrants, the country is still 70 per cent Arab. The Arabs are in actual possession, they exercise rights supported by centuries of history; they constitute a 70 per cent majority, speak their own language, enjoy their traditions and culture, and aspire to live their own life and shape their own destiny. If all these factors do not constitute an incontrovertible legal and moral title, what does?

FREEDOM EARNED

The Arabs have worked their passage to the haven of liberty and earned their right to freedom. In the first World War they rose against their co-religionists, the Turks, in order to be free. They protected Allenby's right flank and helped make Allied victory possible. They deserved the pledges of independence given them by the British, the promise of autonomous government by Anglo-French authorities and the self-determination re-iterated by Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. In this war, Arab Palestine, and other Arab countries, served the United Nations' interests. Besides thousands of volunteers and laborers, they contributed their territories as a base of operation; they gave their oil, provisions, railroads and other means of communication. The very strategic position inhabited by millions of Arabs and utilized for fighting the Axis was, in itself, a great contribution to the war effort of the democracies. Under the circumstances, Palestine, as an Arab country, should enjoy the independent status of its sister states. It is in this light that the Zionist attempt to dominate Palesine should be scrutinized.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

People in America have vague notions about the subject of Palestine, and on the whole they see it from the Jewish point of view. For one thing, there are one and a half million Jewish votes in America compared to a negligible number of Arab votes. Add to the power of votes that of the press, radio, movies and pulpit. These are open to the Jews and closed to the Arabs. This being the case, it is urgent for the Arab case to be presented.

IMMIGRATION IS AGGRESSION

In the first place, it is important to explain that Jewish immigration is unlike any other inasmuch as it is done against the consent of the majority of the country's people. That is enough to make Zionism a movement of aggression which democratic nations should oppose. To the Arabs, Zionist immigration is an invasion and a conquest. When they attain a majority, the Zionists propose to impose an alien political and social system on the native inhabitants. Instead of becoming a part of the adopted country, obeying its laws, accepting its political aims and learning its language, these Jewish guests are set on establishing a society of their own. The Jews are feverishly struggling for a sovereign state which will dominate the political, economic and social life of Palestine. Dr. Eder, once chief of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, stated before the Haycraft Commission that there could be no equal partnership between the Jews and the Arabs but a Jewish predominance.

The Zionists have wielded sufficient political influence over the British government to import half a million Jews into Palestine, all the while suspending the exercise of democratic procedure until they should become the majority and have their way. The reader may decide for himself whether this is diabolical political murder or not! Such a crime would not be tolerated in any civilized community, but it is condoned in the Holy Land. The Zionists are clamoring for a *free, democratic* Palestine, but it is freedom and democracy for themselves and not for the Arabs. Withal, the conscience of the Zionists, as well as that of their Christian supporters, does not seem to be perturbed by this gross injustice. It is defended on the ground that the Jews are wronged in Europe as if wrong to the Jews could be cured by wronging the Arabs. Taking Palestine away from the Arabs is condoned by the excuse that the Jews are able to marshall greater financial resources and that they possess superior technical equipment. If such philosophy is conceded, where would it lead except to the exploitation of the weak by the strong? If Palestine should go to the Jews because they are better able to modernize it, to whom should India, China, Iran and Ethiopia go?

The Arabs refuse to be budged from their moral and legal position by economic sophistries. The right to Palestine does not rest on who can pour more gold into it. Suppose a rich man could modernize a house, does that entitle him to take it away from its poored owner? The Arabs do not care to sell their soul and barter their political heritage for a dubious price. They would prefer poverty with self-respect to so-called prosperity in slavery. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any case, the Arabs have never admitted real economic benefits of Zionism to them. To be sure, the Jews have poured tons of money into the country, but it remains to be seen what will become of it and how permanent it will be. The Arabs realize full well that no amount of money could compensate them for the loss of their lands and political rights.

NO ECONOMIC BENEFITS

As to the benefits of Zionism to the Arab population, it is relevant to state that the major economic resources of the country are in Jewish hands. The two great economic plums, the generation of electric power from the Jordan and the Dead Sea concession were granted to the Jews. In addition, the major contracts for the government and the army go to Jewish firms. Benefits to the Arabs may be easily disproved by the fact that Arab labor is excluded from lands owned by the Jewish National Fund. The Jewish Labor Federation sees to it that Arab labor is resorted to only in extreme necessity. Many Jewish premises were picketed by members of the Jewish Labor Federation when Arab labor was employed. Moreover, once Arab lands passes into Jewish hands, it can never be repurchased. The Arabs are clear in their minds as to what their lot will be in a Jewish state. It will be that of their Canaanite ancestors under Joshua—hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is no wonder then that they resist Zionism with such determination. As to hospitals, schools and other social services, it must be vehemently denied that they are intended for Arab welfare. In fact, more Jews patronize non-Jewish hospitals than non-Jews patronize Jewish hospitals. Arab children who go to Jewish schools are less numerous than Jewish children who go to non-Jewish schools. As Hebrew is the medium of instruction in the Jewish system of education, Arabs are, *ipso facto* excluded.

Hebrew wisdom states that, "Better is a dry morsel and quietness therewith, than a house full of feasting with strife," but the Zionists are not inclined to be guided by biblical wisdom. Ever since its appearance on the Palestinian stage, Zionism has brought strife and bloodshed. Briefly, Zionism has spelled war—war between Arabs and Jews, war between Arabs and British and war between Jews and British. It remains to be seen how many more people will be drawn into the tragic conflict. More tragic still is the obvious certainty that peace is incompatible with Zionism.

OPPOSITION REAL

The Jews have fooled themselves and their friends into believing that opposition to their venture is confined to a small group of reactionary *effendis,* i.e., white collar intelligentia. They have indulged in ascribing intransigence to axis instigation, forgetting that Arab opposition ante-dated both Mussolini and Hitler. Machiavellian designs emanating from British colonial officials have been held responsible by the Jews for Arab hostility. This ignores the grim episode of thousands of British troops suppressing Arab revolts. Nothing is farther from the truth than the frequent Zionist assertion that Arabs and Jews would come to terms if the British would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cease inciting the Arabs. The truth is that the Arabs do not need to be incited against Zionism for fear and dread of it are real, profound and universal. To be sure, the *effendis* are in the vanguard of the opposition to Jewish plans, but behind them are the solid masses of the peasantry. It should not be difficult to see why Arabs and Jews cannot come to terms, for their political aims are diametrically opposed. When the Zionists are dead set on a Jewish majority, a Jewish state, a Jewish army, Jewish predominance; and when the Arabs are equally determined on Arab independence within the framework of the Arab League, one cannot visualize where those two lines can meet.

Arab hostility became more menacing to Zionist aims when it was officially taken up by the surrounding Arab countries. It was first thought that the Palestine Arabs could not, for long, withstand Zionist-British pressure. But the entry of eight independent Arab states into the field alters the situation completely. In the face of such tremendous hostility, one would think that the major Jewish policy would be to win Arab confidence and effect cooperation by deeds. The Arab struggle with Zionism is neither racial nor religious, but political and economic. As to persecuting the Jews, that is a prerogative of Christiandom. Palestine has accommodated over a half million Jewish refugees and if the other countries, such as America, Britain and the Dominions would do likewise, there would be no refugee problem.

In conclusion it must be clearly stated that the problem of refugees should be held distinct from that of political Zionism. It is one thing to appeal for human sympathy and quite another to have schemes of political usurpation.

The solution of this great Palestine problem lies in the democratic policy of letting each country settle its own problems. The wishes of the people now in Palestine—Arabs and Jews—should be the decisive factor.

REFERENCES

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 23, p. 956 (Text of the "Balfour Declaration").

League of Nations. Mandates and Slavery VI AB (1920-22)

League of Nations Official Journal. (1921: 4-7); (1930: 1-6)

League of Nations. Mandates and Slavery VI AB (1930)

League of Nations. Official Journal. (1930: 7-12)

Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry to the United States Government and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, The New York Times, May 1, 1946.

Great Britain:

Papers Presented by Command, Nos. 1785 (the Mandate), 5957 (Hussein-McMahon letters), 3582 (the Passfield White Paper), 3530 (the report of the Shaw Commission), 5479 (the Peel Report), 3692 (statement of policy, October, 1930) 5974.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The English have the know-how

A Raffles' Case

By Charles Fisher

From his column in the Philadelphia Record

IT is our aim to recommend closest study of the Maidstone Mystery to all those scholars of crime who ever thought they detected traces of romanticism or exaggeration in the works of Mr. Edgar Wallace, Mr. Leslie Charteris or the glorious E. W. Hornung.

One recent night, as the lambent rays of a full moon touched the grim battlements of Hever Castle, a powerful Rolls Royce swept noiselessly across the English landscape and came to rest in the courtyard of that famous Kentish stronghold, which was once the home of Ann Boleyn. Four young men descended. They were heavily masked and wore, we are assured, genuine black slouch hats.

Hurling a stone through a window of the billiard room, they waited in silence until the watchman, a Mr. Scholls, hastened to investigate; whereupon they made him fast and, pausing only to place a cushion beneath his head, set about looting the priceless relics of the historic pile.

One of the robbers was clearly a connoisseur. (We can almost hear Mr. Scholls' testimony: "'e were a toff, 'e were; 'e knew wot 'e were a doin' of!") Under his direction the gang made off with a signet ring Henry VIII gave Miss B., the very prayer book she carried to the headsman's block, and some 1500 other jeweled relics immeasurably beyond price. Then the Rolls purred swiftly away leaving Mr. Scholls some time later to wrench free of his bonds and spread the alarm. But by that time the Rolls and the men had vanished; nor has the greatest search in the history of Scotland Yard been able to locate them.

The robbery may truly be called The Most Audacious in the History of British Crime. Or, as the Press of England probably described it:

PERPLEXING INCIDENT IN KENT

Rolls Used by Thieves; Articles Taken From Hever Castle; Crown Jewels Guarded

Now, we are as patriotic as the next man, but we simply don't have crimes like that in America. The trouble is that our writers of shockers don't produce very satisfactory gentlemen thieves and there is, therefore, no art for nature to imitate. We don't give our own criminals anything to shoot for.

But Raffles could have engineered the Maidstone crime! The Saint could certainly have done it (although he would have used a Hirondel, rather than a Rolls Royce). Any of Edgar Wallace's gang were competent to undertake it. Or, has Arsene Lupin been seen in England

© 1946 by the Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recently? Somehow, although M. Lupin is not a true-born Briton, we detect his touch in the operation above any other. Surely, the loot was sufficient to warrant Raffles bespeaking his cooperation.

Personally, we don't believe there's ever a chance of the crime being solved. For this, we fear, is one of those regrettable situations wherein the gentleman thief is the hero. We could be sure of it if only we knew that the robbers wore full evening dress. (We suspect they did. Especially the leader.) We do know, though, that no author in his right mind would change his emphasis in mid-stream. It's too late for Scotland Yard to take the lead now. Even Sherlock Holmes never went after Raffles, although their careers were in full bloom at the same time!

So all of Ann Boleyn's belongings, all the jools and gold-encrusted art works, may be given up for the time being. Until, some night at a London club, a handsome young cricketer named Raffles says to his guests: "Speaking of the Reformation, these little souvenirs might interest you . . ."

The guests—only half-perceiving—will look wonderingly at him and at the merry young Frenchman to whom he has just introduced them. If some memory of the Hever Castle puzzle enters their minds, they will still be bound by their Code. And outside, so to speak, kicking their heels, will wait Mr. Holmes and Dr. Thorndyke and Inspector French and Inspector Bull and all the rest.

Sorry, Gents. It's not your story this time.

Youngsters cry for it

Wanted: Juke Box Teacher

By Henry McLemore

From his column in the Philadelphia Inquirer

IF I didn't have a good job that was earning me a cool six or seven million a year I would become a music teacher.

There must be a lot of money in it. I don't mean the old-fashioned type of music teacher who had a cozy little home on Elm Street and taught Johnny and Sister Mary and Junior the piano and violin.

If you are past 35 you must remember that type of music teacher. Her name was Miss Evelyn or Miss Sarah or Miss Isasgoodasamile, and as soon as you were old enough to have sufficient calcium in your bones to trot you to her home your parents started you off on music lessons.

No, that's not the type of music teacher I mean at all. I would become a teacher of the juke box. From nine until twelve, and from two until six, I would instruct modern youth in the operaton of the juke

© 1946 by The McNaught Syndicate, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

box. I would teach them the approach to the juke box, the proper insertion of coins, and, most important of all, how to get the song you want.

Only last night I was out with the younger set. As a chaperone, of course. And I tried to play a juke box. It was a gorgeous affair. All red lights and green lights and plastic and stainless steel and chromium and what have you. I felt humble approaching it. Standing there in the corner, it made the Taj Mahal seem shabby, and for sheer beauty, it could hold its own with the Grand Canyon by candlelight. As one of the other chaperones, a chap named Larry Johnson, said, "All that juke box needs to make it complete is a prayer rug."

"What do you want me to play, kids?" I called to the merry set of youngsters, who were doing a stately, sedate mess of jive.

"Play us 'Some Sunday Morning,' Uncle Henry," they cried.

It was all I could do to keep from swatting them. If there is anything that a man just this side of 40 hates to be called it is "Uncle." When a man reaches that age, he likes to dream of himself being just as young, gay and buoyant as the youngest freshman. He knows his hair is mighty thin and that he creaks slightly when he walks and has to play doubles at tennis, but, confound it, he doesn't like to be reminded of it.

So I went to the juke box, nickel in hand. I studied the listings of the various songs. I studied them very carefully, despite the blinding lights of the juke, and the fountain which sprayed from its top knot. I read very clearly that "Some Sunday Morning" was No. 4. I inserted the nickel and pushed a button. There was a whirling noise.

You know what I got? A thing called "Bumble Boogie." Not to be daunted, I went back to the juke when "Bumble Boogie" had run its harmonious course and tried again for "Some Sunday Morning." I didn't get it. This time—and my nickels were running out—I got a musical gem called "Symphony."

I had used up almost a dollar's worth of nickels and still couldn't get "Some Sunday Morning." At about 85 cents' worth I called the proprietor, Mr. Arthur Bosworth.

"Mr. Bosworth," I said, "would you be so kind as to call your electrical engineer and see if he can get me 'Some Sunday Morning' on this juke box?"

He called in a tall, handsome chap, carrying a diploma from M.I.T.

"Is this man capable of operating a juke box?" I asked.

"I was in charge of a naval vessel during the war," the M.I.T. graduate said.

I gave him two nickels. He went to work with the touch of a skilled operator. The first tune he got was "Prisoner of Love." The radar failed, he explained. The second tune he got was "Bumble Boogie."

Let us have teachers for the juke box.

The youngsters who are going to run this country in a few years (and who will hate to be called "Uncle") are getting their musical education through the juke box.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITOR

THE COAL STRIKE

Should Congress or the President act to end the coal strike?

CONGRESS: ACT NOW TO CURB LEWIS!

Regardless of policy huddles and half-baked "compromise" gestures that get nowhere, the outstanding fact in the coal crisis that is threatening our whole national economy is the failure of Congress to take forceful action.

To date, after six weeks of strike, Congress has done absolutely nothing while catastrophe plucks at our elbows. As coal stocks run out, the country is slipping into industrial paralysis, transportation tie-ups, illumination brown-outs with worse still to come.

Railroad stoppages may soon halt the movement of foods as well as other necessaries of life. Lack of fuel and steel is shutting down plants employing millions of men. Curtailment of electric power means darkened homes and commercial establishments of every kind.

With 13,000,000 tons of coal lost each week, government action to end the strike has been astoundingly feeble and consistently ineffective.

President Truman has contented himself with admitting that the shut-down of the mines is a "national disaster."

His Labor Department has done nothing in the coal negotiations but prove its utter impotence. Its "conciliators" continue to try fumblingly to "conciliate" but with barren results.

In Congress, where the basic responsibility lies, a few harsh words are uttered about John L. Lewis and several courageous members even introduce bills aimed at the Mine Workers' head. But most of the Congressmen shrug the whole thing off.

In seeking to dodge its responsibility, Congress has made possible the power that John L. Lewis now uses to scourge the American people.

The Secretary of Labor runs around in circles in a pathetic display of unimportance. The President shies away from government seizure of the mines because that device, unless Lewis consents, would not automatically re-open the mines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lewis holds the whip-hand and he is using it without restraint. But how did he obtain it? Only by Congressional acquiescence.

Lewis is getting away with his strike against the public because he is allowed to get away with it. He is the master of the situation only because Congress makes obeisance to him.

Many Congressmen have been behaving as though the strike were somewhere in Afghanistan. But Lewis is their own creature. They made him possible. They must take the blame for his conduct.

The chickens of the Wagner Labor Act and other grants of power to union leaders are coming home to roost. The disaster now striking this nation is only the forerunner of worse calamities unless Congress re-assumes its responsibilities.

Bills that would make illegal the union-levied taxes of the kind Lewis is trying to force upon coal would be one means of fighting labor extortion. As Lewis has made his $50,000,000-a-year royalty the major issue in his contract negotiations, eliminating it by law would hasten settlement of the strike.

But more far-reaching measures are needed. Revision of the outrageously one-sided Wagner Act that nurtures such giant labor dictators as Lewis is essential. So is a thorough housecleaning of labor legislation to the end that collective bargaining cannot be turned into a farce at a union's whim.

Congress made Lewis what he is today. The coal strike is right on Congress' doorstep. It is up to Congress to do something about it—not just call Lewis names.

—*The Philadelphia Inquirer.*

THE ANSWER TO LEWIS

John L. Lewis and his coal strike have the Truman Administration buffaloed. While paralysis creeps through the basic heavy industries of the nation, the President and his advisers are deep in gloom and irresolution.

Under these circumstances, Lewis's promise to Secretary Schwellenbach to meet with the coal operators is a minute concession. It looks like an act of *noblesse oblige*. The monarch of the mine union is being temporarily kind to the United States government. But he seems no more ready to attempt sincere collective bargaining than he has been during the last 20 days of arbitrary refusal to talk, or than he ever was.

The situation has left President Truman "concerned." Recon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

version Director Snyder indicates that two more weeks of the strike will rub salt in reconversion wounds all over the country. Steel production is expected to drop from 73 to 50 per cent of capacity, and auto production is falling off. Production Administrator Small views matters as "very discouraging."

So our national leaders concede that things are bad and will get much worse, while Lewis ignores both them and national necessity. He is sabotaging heavy goods production. He is violating the intent of the Wagner Act by demanding flat commitments from operators in advance of bargaining. He is threatening the coal industry with demands that can only mean increased prices. He is flouting the new and half-tested wage-price formula, and nudging us all further toward inflation.

By his haughty disregard for both government and people, Lewis may think to prove himself stronger than both, and incidentally lord it over the rival C.I.O. The strange thing is that Lewis is doing just what everyone expected him to do, yet no one tried to stop him.

If the President decided to make Lewis behave he would have behind him all the power of government and the wholehearted support of the public. Mr. Truman could, if necessary, take over the coal mines. Lewis's customary answer to that is that the "Government can't mine coal." Still, he has never quite dared challenge the government to mine coal. His men have always gone back to work under government intercession. If the government met Lewis head-on, Lewis would break, and he knows it.

As long as this coal mine kingpin thinks he can toy with government, he will glower and purse his eyebrows. It is conversely typical of his stripe that he understands superior power. Inflated egos and ambitions such as his make it necessary, as a British official has said, that "a democratic government must be careful not to expose its own impotence."

Now the country is treated to just such an exposure, in the face of a possible economic disaster. The Administration's fretfulness will not pass for authority, much less action. The nation has reached a point where the only answer to the anarchy of Lewis is determination in the White House.

—*The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

A GIANT'S STRENGTH

Democracy in America has once more awakened to the fact that it has allowed tyranny to become established within its borders; a tyranny not of a governmental but of a labor leader. John L. Lewis is able to declare whether industry shall close down, and health and welfare suffer; and he gets his power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through absolute and allegedly brutal, control of half a million or more miners.

Already announcements pour in of critical shortages of coal in railroad and industrial stockpiles; of a slashing in Illinois of night-time use of electricity, of anxiety lest such institutions as hospitals and, of course, theaters, may not have to suffer; and the only response from Mr. Lewis is that there is no prospect of an early settlement of differences.

It has been pointed out frequently that the opportunity for this exercise of tyrannous power has sprung from the failure of the Congress to enact suitable legislation curbing labor autocracy —a failure that originated in unwillingness to risk re-election. Yet even where the Congress has acted, as in the sole case of Petrillo, the Legislation has by no means curbed this lesser tyrant.

Now the supply of coal in general is sufficient for three weeks only. If the strike goes on beyond that time, industrial America will go to smash. The only escape appears to lie in yielding to the miners' demands and letting the public be mulcted of the funds with which to meet the cost.

It has been charged that the coal miners are Communistic. Nothing could be more untrue. If we had Communism in this Country there would be no coal strike. Russia, for instance does not allow strikes; it has a persuasive way of dealing with any who upset or try to upset the national economy. What we have here is a natural result of permitting not liberty but license to a tyrant who takes into his own hands the decision as to whether industry and normal life may continue.

There is but one way to meet this sort of thing, and that way does not lie in governmental mediators, called conferences and fact-finding boards—or in abject surrender. It lies in Congressional action. The sooner the country sees this, the better. Perhaps it would be well if the present coal strike does not get early settlement; the object lesson the electorate would receive might lead to the election of a Congress that will act, and not pussyfoot for fear of losing votes.

—*The Portland Press Herald.*

MOUNTING CRISIS

President Truman's significant admission that he views the strike with alarm but does not "yet" consider it a strike against the government at least indicates that the administration is girding for action if a coal settlement is not soon achieved. Whether government seizure of the mines would break the present stalemate is problematical, but it would at least emphasize the fact that strikes in a basic industry such as coal are intolerable impositions upon the body politic, constituting a threat to law and order com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parable to that resulting from outright defiance of the government itself.

The President has stated that if government employees were permitted to exercise the right to strike the government would cease to exist. The truth of that assertion is evident if we stop to consider what would happen if the law enforcement and other protective agencies of government, national and local, were to be paralyzed by strikes. The distinction between these governmental services without which an organized society would disintegrate and many kinds of private service and labor likewise essential to the orderly functioning of an industrial state is today more formal than real. The interest of the public in the method of operation of such basic industries as transportation and coal mining, for example, explains why railways have been nationalized in so many countries and accounts for the promptitude with which Britain's socialistic Labor government proceeded to nationalize the coal mines.

In our opinion, the United States will go the way of other countries in bringing under governmental ownership and control these and other basic industries if labor leaders like John L. Lewis continue to put attainment of their private ends above the community welfare. For unless power lodged in private hands is used with restraint, public resentment will inevitably and at no distant date bring about the downfall of the institutional arrangements that permit of its abuse. There is a large and rapidly expanding field of private industry, including coal mining, so strongly "affected with a public interest" that those who formulate and mold labor and management policies are in fact, though not in name, servants of the public. Labor leaders and managerial heads connected with such industries who refuse to acknowledge a responsibility to society as well as to the workers of the stockholders whom they represent are unwittingly the deadliest enemies of free enterprise in the United States today.

—*The Washington Post.*

• Cleo, the loving companion of Gus, the goldfish, had died. Gus became more and more depressed as the winter wore away. One fine spring morning, as the lady of the house came to pay her respects, she found the goldfish bowl empty. She searched for Gus everywhere but to no avail. She was about to give up when she noticed some movement in a bowl of apricots which stood next to the fish bowl. Gus had taken the plunge to end his loneliness.

• Charles Edison, son of Thomas A., was running for governor of New Jersey in 1940. "People will inevitably associate me with my father," he said, "but I would not have anyone believe that I am trading on the name Edison. I would rather have you know me merely as the result of one of my father's earlier experiments.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Country Comment:

Town Report

FOR a man not particularly civic-minded, I am finding our annual Town Report excellent reading. Take the 70-word report of the inspector of animals: "During the past year one cow reacted to the tuberculin test."

One cow. Here is a subject I can grasp. Here is a problem I can appreciate. I find the simple statement re-assuring and restful.

The inspector's report ends: "During the year, 19 dogs were observed as having bitten persons."

Nineteen dogs. I can picture 19 dogs. I may have occasionally seen that many at once. I can feel sorry for the victims of the dogs with a measured and appropriate sorrow, unlike my vague, chaotic grief for the world's millions who are starving or soon to starve. The 19 dogs have been put under restraint, the bitten people have been taken care of, the problem has been met. The 19 dogs are not the dogs of war.

Or take the report of the police department: Drunkenness, 52; Violation of time parking, 1; Assault and battery, 2; Habitual truant, 1; Neglect of minor children, 1; Larceny, 1; Assault with dangerous weapon, 2; Disturbing the peace, 2.

Doesn't it give you at least the beginning of a feeling of hope for the world that in a New England town of 7,000 during the final year of the worst war in history, the peace was disturbed exactly twice? Yet this town is no more peaceful than hundreds of others all over the country.

In reading a town report you should put two and two together. On page 102 you will read that the town took in considerably more cash in 1945 than it paid out, and that there is a substantial balance in the treasury. On page 81 you will read that there were 108 births as against 82 deaths. And on page 10 you will read: "Ten dead trees were removed from different streets and fifteen new trees were set out." The town is gaining ground.

Not all the report is statistical. After 20 years of faithful service, the janitor of the public library retired with the following citation: "His devotion to duty regardless of weather or other circumstances, his ingenuity in making repairs, his interest in all library affairs will be long remembered and appreciated."

Best of all, I think, are the names of the Appointed Officers. *The Forest Fire Warden* and the five *Deputy Wardens,* the eight *Constables,* and the *Keeper of the Lock-Up,* the *Sealer of Weights and Measures,* the three *Field Drivers,* the three *Fence Viewers,* and the *Pound Keeper,* and the thirteen *Measures of Wood,* and the twenty-eight *Weighers.*

Who could read these offices and the names of the men who fill them and not feel a measure of security even in this Atomic Age?

—*ROBERT FRANCIS*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

By Jasper R. Lewis

"LET US NOW PRAISE FAMOUS MEN"

THE war is definitely over; we have reached the stage of dissection of our military leaders, their qualifications and their weaknesses and errors. *Top Secret,* by Ralph Ingersoll (Harcourt, Brace, $3.00), is the kind of book one expects from Ingersoll: whatever his opinion, he states it plainly and backs it up as well as he can. For that reason those who dislike everything English will relish *Top Secret,* and those who favor Britannia will burn under the collar.

Ingersoll was a staff captain in our army and should have been in a position to see much and hear some of the near-top-level discussion. Undoubtedly, there is much truth in his criticisms of General Montgomery, Winston Churchill and others. There is no reason to doubt his version of political maneuvering to promote British ambitions in glory and the strategy that would serve to aid the postwar empire. It is no secret that many here suspected through the war years that cooperation between Britain and the United States was not what it should have been.

It is of less importance that to Ingersoll, Omar Bradley was the real hero of the war, than that Bradley and others believed a whole year of warfare could have been avoided had it not been for British control of plans and campaigning. This volume makes Bradley the Number One planner, with Patton and Hodges the brilliant action leaders, and Eisenhower a nice fellow, diplomatic, but carefully set up by Churchill to be a figurehead while British officers called the tune. Some parts of these charges must be true; here and there in the record will be found admissions or attempted explanations.

Whether you like Ingersoll's views or not, he has performed a service in recounting these things, to be remembered if future need arises, or to be refuted if possible by those interested. However, for a brilliant picture of D Day and its aftermath, told in terms of individuals and small groups, *Top Secret* is a thrilling, action story, with a touch of humor, an undercurrent of the sadness of pain and death, and a vivid account of just how the Americans did their job. It carries right through to Germany's collapse, (the reader understands the possible fault of the Bulge), or goes across Europe with Patton's men in wild dashes, to turn up at the most unexpected places.

In short, *Top Secret* is a necessary book about our army. It may be a good idea for some allied military men, and some diplomats, to read it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now and realize that motives cannot always be covered.

My Three Years With Eisenhower, by Captain Harry C. Butcher, U.S.N.R. (Simon & Schuster, $5.00), is a whale of a book—in size, scope and contents. There are 900 pages of intimate notes, comments and observations, chiefly on the General of the Army, although frequently on lesser lights. Butcher has a sense of humor, a sense of loyalty (not only to the General but to the C.B.S.), and with his privileged post of official notetaker, had the inside track to more high level secrets which can now be spilled. Naturally most of these secrets are pretty well known now, but here they can be told in their proper sequence and background.

Why the general had a naval aide is simple: as an old friend Butcher was wanted by Eisenhower as an aide, and Butcher happened to be in the Naval Reserve. Butcher's task was to keep a daily record of events, conversations, etc., which is standard executive practice. Out of these confidential notes comes this cheerful, brilliantly written diary. For historical purposes it is excellent. Butcher disclaims expert military strategy, but he relates the opinions of others—the brass—sometimes foreshadowing events, sometimes explaining them, or trying to do so.

Eisenhower, of course, is Butcher's hero, but a pleasant hero, not insisting on worship from his subordinates and not a seeker after the high places. In fact, he appears to be a very decent middle-of-the-road human being, one who did not reach for the stars, but had them offered to him.

As for the political and military facts, reading between the lines, one may feel the truth of some of the charges made elsewhere regarding Eisenhower's troubles with Montgomery and other British generals and the meddling of Mr. Churchill in military affairs. Where Ingersoll makes direct accusations of these things, Butcher merely mentions divided opinions or disagreements which can be diplomatic language for the same thing.

Butcher's volume will prove a mine of information for those who like to dig and discuss; a mine, not of secrets but of recorded facts and opinions. It is fascinating and full of lively comment, but it has several faults. One is that the whole show is given the atmosphere of an English tea party, with the right people running it; the second is that the G.I.—or anyone under the rank of colonel—apparently comes under the heading of props for the military theatre. One might almost say the run of the mill soldier just didn't exist. A third weakness, to my mind, is that any possible errors of judgment, like the Bulge, are lightly touched upon, which is natural in a biographical record of this kind, but detracts from the critical value of the book.

General Wainwright's Story, Edited by Robert Considine, (Doubleday, $3.00), is a story of the humiliation, captivity and suffering of an American general. It is recent enough for everyone to remember—MacArthur's ordered escape, the selection of Jonathan M. Wainwright to take over for as long as might be. It was a definite assignment to defeat and surrender.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wainwright tells his story humbly, with due thought for the hardships of his fellow officers, relating without false pride the indignities and beatings which all of them endured, including Wainwright himself. He need have no unwritten fears that his readers will wonder at his surrender or later acceptance of the cruelties of his Japanese captors. His very modest telling of it establishes him as a humane leader of men, taking his share of the punishment.

It is not often that a war book tells a story such as this of battle, imprisonment and eventual freedom. Wainwright's active part in the war was brief; he is grateful for but disclaims earning his four stars. On this he should have no hesitancy; for the part he played in demonstrating the patience and fortitude of Americans, he earned his promotion the hard way. Here is the story of the Japanese war camps and their bestial keepers: the fraternal spirit shown by the prisoners, in some cases cutting across ranks, is noteworthy. Only one wee note might have been omitted—the occasional backslapping of political figures in American life—possibly for the good of the service.

BRIEFER COMMENT

CURRENT AFFAIRS

A closeup of German psychology is given in *Experiment in Germany,* The Story of an American Intelligence Officer, by Saul K. Padover (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $3.75). The author served in the Psychological Warfare Division of the United States Army, and, out of the endless investigations and reports that were doubtless made to our General Staff, he has fashioned a continuous narrative of experiences and findings. Many of the incidents concerned ordinary people and their private lives but reflected the results of Nazi indoctrination. It is not a war book; later on, it might well serve the Germans of the future as a reminder of what they did.

A "kriegie" is a slang for *Kriegsgefangener*—a prisoner of war. *Diary of a Krieger* by Edward W. Beattie, Jr. (Crowell, $3.00), is reporting the hard way. Beattie, United States Press correspondent, was taken prisoner in September, 1944, and was an involuntary guest at Limburg, Berlin and finally Luckenwalde, until the bitter end. His story of Germany from the inside is different in that he was fairly well treated, saw little of the worst brutalities and is mostly concerned with reporting personal impressions, his own and those of others. The most surprising feature of it is the evidently high morale of the author throughout his experience; it sounds too genuine to have been artificially added. Beattie seems to have had the time of his life.

Detailed stories of work and struggles among the guerrillas in the Philippines under Japanese occupation make sometimes exciting and sometime maddening reading. *Guerrilla Padre in Mindanao,* by Edward Haggerty (Longmans, Green, $2.75), is the record of Father Hag-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gerty's efforts in the hills, helping the natives and doing what he could to carry on the fight. It is the story of a good man.

BIOGRAPHY

The story of the founding of Islam is the biography of the Prophet of Allah. *The Messenger,* The Life of Mohammed, by R.V.C. Bodley, (Doubleday, $3.00), is easy reading, full of action, and very plainly told mundane considerations. Bodley has no illusions about the practical side of religions, Christian, Jewish or Islamic and even in wholesale "liquidations" finds historical precedents. It is history and adventure, to say nothing of love interest, in which Mohammed maintained his end.

Howard Spring, surveying the world through two wars, finds our much vaunted Christian civilization not much ahead of where it was 2,000 years ago. *And Another Thing,* (Harper's, $2.50), is biographical in that it reflects Spring's religious meditations and his philosophy for the world at large in its present predicament. His conviction is that "you will never get rid of war by declaring in an international congress that it is 'outlawed' ". It requires what might be called a universe-rocking conversion to brotherly love. Spring doesn't say return to Christ's preachings: he apparently agrees with the statement that "Christianity hasn't failed, it has never been tried." He makes no plea; he tells in simple language what his own thoughts are on the religious aspects of our time. His book is beautifully written, and his musings, free from creed and cant, are as near inspiration as anything recently printed.

Down at the other extreme, if you remember *Ballyhoo* of 15 years ago, you will enjoy *How to Grow Old Disgracefully,* or Anthony's Adversities, by Norman Anthony (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $2.75). In this, Anthony, who fathered and mothered the comic of the 1930's, tells all, about himself, his associates and how they lived, worked and played. The "fresh magazine—kept fresh by cellophane" is no more, but, while it lived its lusty, ribald life, it was the funniest "funny" of its time, and its time was the era of that wonderful nonsense following 1929. The book is good for laughs, too, and some of the favorite cartoons are included. What Anthony did with his own life is his business, but what he tells you about it can be your entertainment.

FARMING

So much is being heard of the return to the farm that a book that goes into the subject in a practical way is not amiss. *Success on the Small Farm,* by Haydn S. Pearson (Whittlesey House, $2.50), first shocks the dreamer of the one-acre farm by cautioning that ten acres should be the minimum for a paying venture. He is enthusiastic, but he is also very business-like; equipment costs real money. It is a machine age, and the small farm must be efficient to produce. If you have the yen for a farm, Pearson's book will either cure you or help you.

FICTION

The Intruders, by Robert Bright,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Doubleday, $2.50), is a powerful piece of fiction based on racial intolerance, not so much in the little southern town in which the action is set, as between classes: In addition to the white versus black problem, there is a half-Jewish girl refugee from the storms of Europe. The lesson is clear; the pace of the story is swift and the conclusion, unavoidable.

A story of China in the present generation, *The Golden Coin,* by Lin Taiyi (John Day, $2.75), takes in a little of the war (at least the results of bombing) but only in passing. The novel deals with a young girl married to an ulcered older teacher, and her thwarted desire for life and living. Being by a Chinese and about Chinese, it needs no made atmosphere, as it carries its own, pungent and yet melancholy.

Another tale out of China, but not by a Chinese, is *Peony,* by Keith West, (Macmillan, $2.00). It is quite different from its predecessor, *Winter Cherry,* but you will enjoy Peony's mental rebellion against woman's place in her world, and her acceptance of life's decisions—when she helped make them.

Theodore Dreiser's last work before his death, *The Bulwark,* (Doubleday, $2.75), is based on the lives of Quakers in twentieth century Philadelphia, with the older generation troubled by and unable to understand the younger. Although it is Dreiser's first novel in 20 years, and he had passed three score and ten, there can be no doubt that he understood the present generation, including campus life and humanity in general. Serious readers will like it.

Isabel Dick, whose *Wild Orchard* made excellent reading, has another delightfully different novel in *Country Heart,* (Crowell, $2.75). Again, it is a story of her home country, Tasmania, with her characters drawn from that garden spot. While there is no great excitement, anyone who likes close-to-the-soil living and the simpler side of life can get away from the 1940's for awhile.

Tempered Blade, by Monte Barrett (Bobbs-Merrill, $2.75), is the story of Jim Bowie, celebrated Indian fighter, backwoodsman and almost legendary figure of his time. Here is the story of Texas and the frontier of a hundred years ago and more: excitement, war, Santa Anna and the Alamo, with love interest to boot. It's exciting reading.

• On many Pacific islands it is the custom for a man to shake hands with himself when he meets his wife's relatives. Here he shakes hands with himself when he doesn't.

—*Passing Variety*

• A man from Aberdeen asked a grocer in Glasgow for a penny-worth of cheese.

"We don't sell penny-worths", the storekeeper replied.

"Well, show me two penny-worth", the Scot replied.

As soon as the grocer put the cheese on the counter, the Scot whipped out his pocketknife, cut the cheese in two, put down his penny and, pocketing his purchase, said: "Trouble with you is—you're lazy."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

ON the professional stage the reign of musical comedies continues without abatement. Two new musicals, *St. Louis Woman* and *Call Me Mister,* have established themselves on Broadway, while other cities on the seaboard have been receiving the new Irving Berlin show, *Annie Get Your Gun,* which seems headed for phenomenal success, and *Shootin' Star,* another Billy the Kid saga which has some remarkable music but is sending out distress signals.

St. Louis Woman is the result of a distinguished collaboration. It is based on the novel, "God Sends Sunday," by Arna Boutemps. The musical book was written by Boutemps and the late Countee Cullen, one of our ablest Negro poets. The lyrics are written by Johnny Mercer, who is well known to the trade for such hit tunes as *Lazybones* and *Atcheson, Topeka and Santa Fe.* The music is by Harold Arlen, who provided the score for *Bloomer Girl, Hooray for What* and *The Wizard of Oz.* The settings and costumes are by Lemuel Ayres, the designer of *Oklahoma* and *Bloomer Girl.* The new show is directed by none other than Rouben Mamoulian, famed for *Oklahoma, Carousel, Porgy and Bess* and many other stage and screen successes. The cast includes the miniscule but invincible Nicholas Brothers, Rex Ingram, who played De Lawd in the screen version of *Green Pastures,* Juanita Hall, Ruby Hill, who is probably the most beautiful newcomer to the stage in many a year and another newcomer, Pearl Bailey, whose massive build and flat voice, combined with an excellent sense of timing, make her a remarkable comedienne.

Something noteworthy could be expected from such pooling of talents, and enough emanates from it to attract the customers. The story, set in the St. Louis of 1898, revolves around the fabulously lucky jockey, Little Augie, who wins every race and throws money around lavishly until he takes up with Della. Taking her away from the burly saloonkeeper, Bigelow, is quite a feat for the pint-sized Augie, and his raptures are well deserved. He pours all his love on her, and, when pressed by a puritanical sister, he even proproposes marriage — albeit reluctantly, not quite seeing the necessity for it. But his luck changes and he even goes to jail for the murder of Bigelow, who is shot by a discarded mistress. He is acquitted after a confession is wrung from the woman in an effective funeral scene. But by now, Della, who has a sinful past, is convinced that she is responsible for his bad luck. She leaves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him and returns to the saloon. The conclusion is a happy one: Little Augie, who has gone away to try his luck elsewhere, returns after many triumphs to find her still loyal to him, wins an important race in St. Louis which proves to her that she is not unlucky for him, and the lovers are reunited.

Humor and pathos are not absent in the story. Little Augie has enough dash and manliness to win our amused sympathy. The colorful settings transport the action to a musical fairyland. A cake walk number is quite wonderful. "Come Rain or Come Shine" makes a moving lyric. A children's song, "Chinquapin Bush," is lovely; an infant with the voice of an operatic tenor (Herbert Coleman) sings a touching pseudo-spiritual, "We Shall Meet to Part, No Never." There is a rather fine spiritual, "Leavin' Time," in the funeral scene; and Pearl Bailey brings the rafters down with the numbers, "Legalize My Name" and a "Woman's Prerogative."

If, nevertheless, *St. Louis Woman* adds up to a tepid evening of theatre, it cannot be by simple arithmetic. Is it possible that we have come to expect greater emotional depth and excitement from Negro musicals? This is probably the case, for *St. Louis Woman* invites a comparison with *Porgy and Bess* that leaves the former in the lurch. *Porgy and Bess* had complete integrity of human emotion in a romantic setting, whereas *St. Louis Woman* makes a strong bid for this experience without capitalizing on it. Moreover, even in a highly romanticized atmosphere *Porgy and Bess* managed to express the realities of work, domestic life, and local attitudes. *St. Louis Woman* hardly rises a notch above the false and outmoded view of the Negro as a sport-loving, drinking, dancing, marriage-avoiding, work-allergic, happy-go-lucky exotic. Here he lives in splendid isolation from the white world and manages to wear the finest clothing and toss money around with the abandon of a rajah. Here the Negro has no analytic powers, no capacity for reflection, no sense of fatality deeper than a belief in bad luck. The result is a story scraped from the top stratum of showmanship where there is only "happy dust" and no soil. And this is true not merely of the story, since the generative concept necessarily infiltrates everything. The lyrics, the music, the choreography, the settings, and the costumes too often reveal the same superficiality and the same tinsel quality. If, on the whole, *St. Louis Woman* is pervaded by mediocrity and tends to be generally tepid, the blame must rest with the ruling conception and pinchbeck inspiration of the musical. The good things in it are sufficient only for an evening of mildly pleasurable entertainment.

All reservations must, however, be waived in the case of the revue *Call Me Mister*. Not that this musical isn't uneven, but that its shortcomings, as in three dispersed chapters of a sailor-and-girl love story, are only sporadic and quickly compensated, and that the over-all effect is one of freshness, intelligence and verve. In view of the sad state of musical revues over a long period,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Call Me Mister is doubly welcome on Broadway, and it is not out of order to hope that its instant success will encourage further efforts along the same lines. It is refreshing to get away from the mammoth splendors of last season's *Seven Lively Arts* and the coy decadence of this season's *Three to Make Ready*. The *Pins and Needles—Meet the People* type of variety show should be encouraged not only for the refreshing enchantment of this kind of divertisement, but for the talent it invariably introduces. We hear a great deal about how many actors still remain unabsorbed by the professional stage. A revue can absorb a dozen of them for every individual employed by the conventional one-set, small-cast realistic play. That there is gold to be had in the untapped mass of young actors is evidenced by the emergence of Marlo Brando from the Dramatic Workshop which maintains a repertory of plays and by the abundance of talent that emerges from *Call Me Mister.*

This venture marks the realization of a hope by Melvyn Douglas and Herman Levin, each of whom brought back from the war a resolve to launch a revue about the returning soldier. Pooling intentions and resolutions, they have created just such a revue with a cast composed almost exclusively of ex-G.I.'s and their feminine counterparts. Count among the government issue to the stage Betty Garrett, the perfect musical comedienne; Lawrence Winters, a superb singer; Jules Mushnin, a very versatile comic; Bill Calahan, Harry Clark, Paula Bane, a new nightingale, the author of the sketches Arnold Auerbach (and writing good sketches is no mean accomplishment), the scene designer Lester Polakov, and the director Robert H. Gordon, who produced 16 overseas musical shows after an uneven carreer on Broadway except for his initial triumph with *Pins and Needles*. Choreography by John Wray and musical direction by Lehman Engel, both well regarded by the trade, also deserve plaudits. Harold Rome, who wrote the music for *Pins and Needles,* is the composer and attains equal distinction here.

A revue cannot really be reviewed. The savor is not in the words but in the total execution. Among mass numbers, *Going Home Train* is a stunning performance vocally and visually. *Welcome Home* is a delightful travesty on how civilians have expected to treat G.I.'s, who must be a sore disappointment when they return minus neuroses and *sans* sex-hunger. *Surplus Values* is first-rate comic recitative by Betty Garrett. *Off We Go* is good satire on a doughfoot's vision of the life of luxury reserved for the Air Corps. *The Red Ball Express* is a powerful song for Lawrence Winters and cuts deeply into the race problem, and *The Face on the Dime* is a fine tribute to F. D. R. Betty Garrett's *South America, Take It Away* travesties Latin-American rhythms so aptly in words and pantomime that it brings the house down, and the *South Wind* sketch, topped by *The Senator's Song,* is a delightful excoriation of certain Bourbon demagogues. All told, here is God's plenty for everyone in songs, dances, and playlets.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The only straight play that might have vied with such a treat might have been the Spewacks' newspaper satire, *Woman Bites Dog*. Bella and Sam Spewack, old hands at travesty, hit upon an excellent subject in the three members of a reactionary newspaper family which does not defy identification. But the Spewacks did not repeat the success of their famous Hollywood spoof, *Boy Meets Girl*. Spoofing, contrary to general opinion, is difficult and rare, and twice as difficult and rare in the drama because it must be maintained for two hours, must accord with the customary necessity of dramatic progression, and must sustain itself without normally enjoying the benefit of absorption in a character's human diversity and complexity. To master the unmanageable nag of travesty beyond the length of a lap, the playwright must be extremely agile and inventive, and genius such as Aristophanes and W. S. Gilbert possessed comes all too infrequently. The Spewacks came close to it when they wrote *Boy Meets Girl,* and where they fell short of mastery they received good support from Hollywood's own antics in the early days. They also helped themselves generously to an appealing story of a young man and his girl tossed about on the gales of madcap motion picture intrigue.

In *Woman Bites Dog,* the Spewacks hit upon a rich but less yielding source of burlesque in the fabulously egotistic anti-British, anti-Russian mid-Western publisher, competently played by Taylor Holmes, in his cynical brother, ably represented by the sour-faced Reyall Beal, and his feather-brained sister. The authors struck a rich vein of plot in a returning soldier's resolve to make a monkey of the publisher who jeopardized the war effort and in the synthetic red-scare to which the latter succumbs with megalomaniac frenzy. The publisher is led to believe that the soldier's home town has gone completely communistic, whereupon he rides straight to madness and libel suits on the wings of his newspaper scoop. The soldier finds an able accomplice in the newspaper woman who is so disgusted with her job and so unhappy over the spinelessness of her fiancé, the managing editor, that she confirms the G.I.'s cock-and-bull story. And indeed much of this story is both amusing and barbed.

It could not, however, sustain itself for an entire evening, especially in the short-lived production which suffered from a weak cast and from direction that was unequal to the demands made upon it. The authors aborted their intrigue somewhat with a weak conclusion, failed to make enough of the comic potentialities of the conflict of the double-crossing relatives, and made too little of the love-story upon which much of the action hinges. Especially unfortunate was their initial treatment of the publisher, who was made so flagrantly mad at the start that no further revelations concerning him were possible. He was already a caricature when we first meet him. Thereafter the authors were caricaturing a caricature, which could become tedious even in the best hands.

The pity of it is that none of these faults were irremediable. The blame must lie either with the pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ducer and the director, who may have failed to urge the necessity of revisions, or with the authors, if they happened to resist admonitions. This is doubly unfortunate since they had an excellent theme, in fact an important one, and since there was enough spirit in the writing to keep the play afloat for a good long stretch. The reviews were unnecessarily severe, although it is not difficult to understand the reviewers' disappointment over what they saw. But then no play is ever evaluated; it is either overrated or underrated. There is no room for a middle ground in the theatre as it exists and in dramatic criticism as it is currently practiced.

Perhaps, however, *Woman Bites Dog* is not destined to complete quiescence after its recent demise. The same authors had similar difficulties with an earlier satire on journalism, *Clear All Wires*. They snatched victory out of the jaws of defeat some years later by turning the play into the delightful and successful Victor Moore musical, *Louisiana Purchase*. *Woman Bites Dog* would make another excellent musical comedy.

It is noteworthy, too, that nearly all superior clowning is now monopolized by motion pictures, perhaps because the mobile camera affords so many more opportunities for a true-blue zany. This is currently to be seen in the case of two new pictures which are headed for a successful longevity, *The Kid From Brooklyn* and *A Night In Casablanca*. The Spewacks had neither Danny Kaye nor the Marx Brothers at their disposal. The Golden Age of clowning has moved in the direction of The Golden Gate, or, more exactly, to the spot in Southern California where the Rhine-gold hoard now reposes.

• "You wait twenty minutes for a bus", the customer growled, "and then four of them arrive all together in a line."

"Convoy system", the conductor replied, "We haven't lost a single bus this trip."

—Herald

• An unconscious man was picked up after an explosion and taken to the hospital.

When he came to, the surgeon tried to cheer him up, "You'll undoubtedly be able to obtain a considerable amount of damages, Mr. Johnson."

"Damages!" the patient screamed. "What do I want with damages? I've got all the damages I want now. What I need is repairs."

• A dry goods proprietor was burned out the very day he had signed *a* fire insurance policy. Although the company suspected arson, they had no proof.

The manager sent the man the following query: "Sir: You took out an insurance policy from us at 10:00 A. M. and your fire did not break out until 3:30 P. M. Will you kindly explain the delay?"

—Prattler

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The International Scene

Around a felt-covered table in Paris and in back of a long, curved desk in New York diplomats groped for a lasting peace. In Paris, long steeped in diplomatic traditions, they were concerned with the problems of peace-making; in New York, as new an international center as the goal of United Nations, they concentrated on peace-keeping. That both were highly interdependent and dependent on the favorable relations of the Big Three soon became evident.

MORE TREATIES OF PARIS?

The foreign ministers of Great Britain, the United States, Soviet Russia and France convened in the seventeenth century Luxembourg Palace in Paris on April 25. They had come to consider once again the touchy problems which had broken up their conference in London early last fall: namely, the treaties of peace with Italy, Finland and the Balkan countries. Except for the substitution of Vyacheslav Molotov for Andrei Y. Vishinsky, his Vice Commissar, the personnel was the same—James F. Byrnes, Ernest Bevin and Georges Bidault. Only China was not there.

The conference opened in an air of cordiality. At first it seemed that traditional diplomacy was replacing the name-calling style of the London conference. Mr. Molotov quickly and quietly removed the obstacle that had broken up the earlier conference and agreed to permit France to sit in on all the discussions. Mr. Byrnes made even more a significant step by breaking with what some call American tradition and proposing a Big Four treaty to guarantee the demilitarization and disarmament of Germany for 25 years. Loud or soft, however, the stumbling blocks soon came to light and the conference assumed the tense atmosphere of all contemporary international conferences. New Russian demands replaced the old ones and Mr. Byrnes' proposal was viewed cooly by the others as a retreat by the United States from European affairs.

By the end of the second week, some, if not much, progress had been made. The Soviet Union has apparently backed down on her demand for trusteeship over Tripolitania and has agreed to sole administration by Rome, under a United Nations trusteeship, of course, over Italy's North African colonies. On reparations, one conclusion was reached. Italy will pay Soviet Russia $100,000,000. This was a concession, fortunate or otherwise, by Great Britain and the United States. On the other hand, Molotov withdrew his objections to Mr. Byrnes' proposal for the establishment of an inter-Allied war crimes commission to operate for a limited period after the treaty is signed. Minor border changes in the Balkans, among them the return to Rumania of Transylvania, were also agreed upon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still unsolved, however, are most of the crucial questions. Dominant among these is Trieste. Yugoslavia has said that she will accept no treaty which gives this strategic Adriatic port to Italy. This claim is backed by Molotov. The other three ministers feel that the city, 75 per cent Italian in population, should remain part of Italy. Other problems, not on the agenda, but demanding immediate attention, are those of Germany, (the Ruhr Valley in particular for the French) and Austria, which the United States keeps bringing up. Another question is the general peace conference, which was supposed to have met May 1 to discuss the preliminary peace treaties which were supposed to have been drafted by that time. It is now over a year since the war ended in Europe. Until the peace treaties are signed, Europe remains politically unstable.

PEACE IN NEW YORK

While the four diplomats in Paris tried to straighten out the effects of World War II, the 11 members of the Security Council in New York sought to prevent a possible World War III. Having survived the hard blows of the original Iranian crisis, the Council turned to other tasks. Dr. Oscar Lange of Poland brought formal charges against Franco and declared that Spain was a threat to international peace and security. He charged that Spain was promoting "scientific research by German scientists engaged in devising new means of warfare" and asked the Security Council to direct all U. N. members to break diplomatic relations with Spain. Great Britain and the United States talked of insufficient proof. Mr. Gromyko, however, did not hedge: "The formula 'insufficient evidence' has . . . [been] applied very readily and very frequently in the past by supporters . . . of the notorious policy of non-intervention." Consequently the Soviet Union did not vote when the others decided to refer the charge to a five-man investigating committee, scheduled to report on May 31.

Although the initial crisis was over, the Iranian-Soviet dispute was still on the agenda. When the Council, at Iran's request, refused to drop the question, Mr. Gromyko declared that he would not sit in on any discussions on the Iranian question. The date, May 6, for the completion of the withdrawal of Russian troops from Azerbaijan came and went without official word from either party. A vague message finally came from Iran stating uncertainty as to whether or not the troops were completely removed. Until the situation can be clarified, the Council has postponed further discussion.

Thus far five cases have come up before the Security Council. (1) Russian troops in Iran. (2) British activities in Greece and Indonesia. (3) Anglo-French troops in Syria and Lebanon. (4) Albanian member-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship in the U. N. (5) Franco Spain. Intertwined in these considerations was a technical problem emphasized by the Iranian case: Must the Council end consideration of an issue when the state introducing it withdraws its complaint? The Council decided that it did not have to but was left with an equally perplexing problem. Could the Security Council be effective if great powers freely boycotted such offensive discussions?

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Mr. Hoover returned from his heart-rending tour on May 10. The former President had traveled more than 27,000,000 miles in his survey of the food situation the world over. Before giving his official report to the American people, Mr. Hoover stated, "We are facing the greatest potential famine in all human history. There is only 30 to 60 days' supply of food in the famine areas of 27 different countries. They have five months to go until the next harvest."

Still, however, United States' wheat moves slowly. Even the government's limited offer of 30 cents a bushel bonus failed to unlock great quantities of the 5,300,000 tons of wheat estimated to be in the storage bins. Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson reports that it will be "extremely difficult" to meet the country's goal of 2,000,000 tons promised to famine areas by July 1. Criticism of the farmers and of the government has rolled in from all sides. But criticism alone will not feed starving Europeans.

HOT POTATO

Lord Balfour's Declaration in November, 1917, set the Jewish world afire: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for Jewish People." Later, the pledge was included in the League of Nations mandate to Great Britain. Enthusiastic Zionists, however, passed lightly over the second part of the declaration: ". . . [but] nothing shall be done [to] prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities." The Arabs claimed that the Jews were wrong in their interpretation of the British view and voiced loud indignation. Thus a latent religious controversy was transformed into a burning political conflict, a conflict too bitter to be abated by compromise.

The problem of Jewish-Arab rivalries expanded in the decades that followed and plagued many international conferences. Then came World War II and the effects of the anti-Semitism which had preceded it. An estimated 4,000,000 Jews had been exterminated by the so-called superior race, i. e., the Nazis, and by the beginning of May, 1946, there were 100,000 "stateless" Jews in the Displaced Persons camps and 500,000 elsewhere in Europe. The Zionists pressed for their goal. President Truman suggested that Great Britain open up Palestine to the war-ravaged Jews. But Great Britain curtly replied that the Americans were "long on the advice and short on the responsibility." The outcome of this friendly spat was the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

For three months the committee questioned Arabs, Jews and Christians on Palestine's capacity to absorb Jews, a "permanent solution" for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country and what countries outside Europe might take Jews. On April 30, the much-waited report was issued. The committee recommended that 100,000 Jews be transferred to Palestine as soon as possible (no long-term immigration policy was formulated); the United States and Great Britain, along with other countries, should try to find new homes for the Jews *and* other displaced persons regardless of creed or nationality; and "Palestine shall be neither a Jewish state nor an Arab state" but must safeguard the interests of Moslems, Jews and Christians alike.

The people most concerned, namely the Jews and the Arabs, reacted in the expected manner. The Jews welcomed the Anglo-American sympathies and the invitation to 100,000 of them to enter Palestine, but criticized the committee for its failure to recommend a Zionist state. They viewed the report as another instance of "Arab appeasement" and said they would continue to fight for their goal, an independent national state. The Arabs, having gained nothing, reacted more violently than the Jews. Their leaders called a general strike in Palestine and the Arabs in Syria and Lebanon followed suit. The Arab League members of the United Nations were asked to bring the question as a "threat to the peace" and appealed to the Soviet Union for support.

In the United States the report was received without enthusiasm, although President Truman did say he was "very happy" about it. Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee implied that the report did not express government policy. No action would be taken, he said, until Great Britain could be sure of the extent of American assistance and until the Jews were disarmed. And so the Palestine issue is "solved" . . . once again. (See the Forum on Zionism elsewhere in this issue.)

NEW LAWS FOR OLD

France must try again. The constituent assembly, elected last October, drafted a constitution and submitted it to the French people on May 5, 1946. They rejected it.

The constitution had re-affirmed French faith in the "principles of 1789—the charter of her liberation." Thus far all was well. Legislative and executive authority would have been vested in a single-house National Assembly, elected for five years. The President would have been elected by the Assembly but would have had no real power. The President of the Council of Ministers, or Premier, would have been the chief executive officer. Therein lay the weakness of the constitution in the eyes of the voters. The proposed elimination of the executive and the concentration of authority in the Assembly initiated a bitter political debate. The Communists, with the largest number in the constituent assembly argued that only a strong legislature could express the "sovereign" will of the people. The Socialists supported the Communists on the single-house feature but favored a stronger executive. More decisive objection came from the Popular Republicans. They wanted a two-house legislature with a strong executive and opposed a sharp trend to the left.

In the national referendum, the conservative elements won decisively.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now a new constituent assembly must be elected and will be asked to frame a new constitution as quickly as possible. The election is scheduled for June 2nd, until that time, the coalition cabinet has decided to remain in office. The official Fourth Republic of France is thus delayed another month.

THE SETTING SUN

While Justice is being meted out to the Nazis in Nuremberg, Japanese leaders are receiving the same fare in Tokyo. On April 29, the Far East International Military Tribunal opened charge against 28 members of the Japanese "criminal militaristic clique." Among others, this select group includes General Hideki Tojo, who was premier of Japan durng most of the war; Admiral Osami Nagano, Chief of Staff, who ordered the attack on Pearl Harbor; General Kenji Doihara, who directed the attack on Manchuria in 1931; General Iwani Matsui, who commanded the rape of Nanking in 1937. In general they were accused of teaming up with Germany and Italy to conquer the world. Specifically the indictment included crimes similar to those determining the proceedings at Nuremberg: crimes against the peace or violation of international law and treaties by war and aggression; "conventional" war crimes or violation of the "customs of war"; and crimes against humanity. Judging these war criminals are the representatives of the nine Allied nations which signed the Japanese surrender—the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, France, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the Netherlands. In setting up the court, supervisor General MacArthur reserved the power to review court sentences, appoint the court's president (Sir William Floyd Webb of Australia) and appoint the chief prosecutor (Joseph B. Keenen of the United States). Otherwise the 28 defendants all facing death sentences, are in the hands of the court. Thus far all have pleaded not guilty.

On the other side of the world, meanwhile, the Nuremberg trials drag on. The Nazi defendants are having their scheduled opportunity to defend themselves and "justify" their past actions. One-time Governor General of Poland, Dr. Hans Frank, confessed his participation in the destruction of Jews; "We have fought against Jewry for years . . . A thousand years will pass and this guilt of Germany will still not be erased." On the other hand the court heard very little about guilt from Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht or about his vast financial manipulation for the Nazis as Minister of Economics and President of the Reichsbank. Dr. Schacht concentrated, however, on deriding his fellow conspirators. Although these proceedings are important as far as the trial and history are concerned, the world is impatiently waiting for the verdict, both in Germany and in Japan.

NO COMPROMISE

For seven weeks the British mission conferred with representatives of India's two leading political parties in an effort to bring about a reconciliation. But the Congress party and the Moslem League could not agree

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on any formula. Reluctantly, on May 12, the British called it quits. Thus for a second time within a year the Congress (Hindu) party, which wants a unified India, and the Moslems, who want a separate state, have failed to reach any settlement. Placing the blame for the failure on neither of the parties the British envoys declared that the episode "does not in any way" affect the mission's purpose of setting up an all-Indian, interim government until such time as a final government can be established for an Independent India.

The Domestic Scene

Eleven months after V-E Day, the nation was still suffering from its reconversion hangover. No sooner was one crisis over, leaving its scars on the economy, than another received the attention of the government, the headline writers, the public. There was the automobile strike, the steel strike, and finally the soft coal strike. When the Lewis crisis was disposed of, what would be next on the agenda? Or would there be a temporary cessation of hostilities until the crucial fall elections are over?

John Llewelyn Lewis is an astute man, smart enough to know when the heat is on and when discretion calls for a strategic retreat. The mounting public wrath and imminent congressional action could not be ignored. On May 13, therefore, the United Mine Workers returned to work during a two-week truce. Conferences between union officials and the coal operators continued every day during the respite, and only time could tell whether the temporary "back to work" order was little but a stop-gap measure or the first real break in the 42-day coal deadlock. Even the two week's resumption of mining was opposed by 30,000 miners, and 42 locals rejected the truce, sticking by their policy of "no contract no work."

Just as the miners' cause might be, and unjust as Lewis' tactics certainly were, the nation-wide effects of the coal strike left a permanent mark on the reconversion economy.

UNCLE SAM OVER A BARREL

In March the production train was steaming full speed down reconversion's tracks. With the steel strike over, the output for that month set a new high. The coal strike crashed head-on with the express, and unlike previous labor disputes, this one would hold up production for far longer than the strike's actual length. The commodity involved is basic for most production, and as May went, so will go June.

A coal-less month left its impact on the nation. Pittsburgh's steel production was down to 54 per cent of capacity, and 35,000 steel workers were idle or reduced to part-time pay. Over 20,000 railroad men were out of work. Chrysler and Ford employees were temporarily laid off. Major cities went back to the brownout. Chicago's industries were on a 24-hours-a-week electricity ration. Production of everything from nylons to fertilzer was halted.

The Office of Defense Transportation was forced to order curtail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments far beyond those imposed during the war. On May 10, most industries could not ship or receive materials when an O.D.T. order stopped the shipment of all railroad freight except food, fuel and medical supplies. A 25 per cent reduction in passenger service was ordered effective May 10.

The effectiveness of the soft coal strike could be seen in two sets of figures. In March, from 50,000,000 to 54,000,000 tons of soft coal were mined; in April, the output fell to a mere 3,000,000 tons from unorganized or Progressive mines.

With virtual economic stagnation facing the country, what was the government to do? President Truman conceded that the coal strike was a "national disaster," but there wasn't much action he could take. Even government seizure of the mines, an action which Civilian Production Administrator Small advocated, might not be an easy way out. Last year Roosevelt was able to persuade the miners to return to work under government seizure, but then, the war was still in progress. You can't force a man to work when the Thirteenth Amendment forbids involuntary servitude.

An angry Congress, however, was determined to act. And the two weeks truce conceded by Lewis apparently wasn't stopping the legislation. Pushing aside all other legislation, on May 10, with the strike 40 days old, the Senate hauled from its Labor Committee the toned-down version of the Case Strike Control Bill, passed weeks ago by the House. The Upper Chamber echoed the sentiments of New Dealer Lucas, who described Lewis as "drunk with power," and the Senate was prepared to sober up the U.M.W. president by stripping from him a large measure of that power.

The Lucas amendment to the Case bill would give the President, upon determining that a particular work stoppage was seriously injuring the public interest, the right to call upon the parties of the dispute to resume work. If they refused, the President could seize the property and operate it under the conditions which prevailed before the stoppage. Labor union officials would have a statutory duty to try to persuade the men to return to work. Those refusing to return would lose their jobs and their rights under the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

SPRING FEVER OR ELECTION TREMORS?

It took John L. Lewis to build a fire under Congress. Until the second week in May practically none of the major proposals requested by the administration had received final congressional action. The summer primaries and the fall elections appeared to be first on the list of "musts."

The House established its position as the drastic modifier of administration policy. Before the Senate were first, the bills emasculated by the lower chamber—price control, the draft—and original bills—the British loan, service merger. It is anybody's guess as to how much of this legislative backlog would be satisfactorily disposed of by the July recess

ISSUE POSTPONED

The Selective Service Act was scheduled to run out on May 15. By the time the House got through with its theoretical extension of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measure, any resemblance between the House version and the original was not Congress's fault.

Ironically enough, it was probably only the coal strike which saved the draft from ending on May 15. To clear the way for anti-Lewis legislation, and because the Smith-Connally Anti-Strike Act, giving the government the right of seizure, is an amendment to the Selective Service Act, the hard-pressed Senate passed a six week's temporary draft extension until it could devote its energy to full consideration of the matter. The measure then returned to the House, which had originally turned thumbs down on the administration's request for a year's extension of selective service. The issue had only been postponed for six weeks; then the fight commences anew.

When the House was considering draft extension, General Eisenhower appeared before congressional committees six times to plead for a year's renewal to supply replacements for overseas men and to secure the 1,070,000 men the Army considers its absolute minimum for occupation and security needs. Eisenhower told Congress that anything less than a year's extension "is a gamble any way you look at it. . . . With all the sincerity and force at my command, I urge you—do not take this gamble."

The House, however, elected to yield to the gambling instinct. On April 15, a month before the sands of the original measure ran out, the House passed the measure with nine vital amendments, and in place of a year, the extension was for only nine months The two most crippling amendments exempted 18 and 19 year olds, which deprive the Army of its largest manpower reserve, and suspended inductions until October 15, If by that time the President determined that volunteer enlistments fail to meet quotas, he authorized to order inductions continued.

That elections were not far from the House's mind can be seen by the fact that it will not be Congress, but the President, who must order inductions started two and a half weeks before the fall elections. The House bill, which also exempts fathers, places its main reliance on volunteers, and the measure provides for pay increases to volunteers of from 10 per cent for generals to 50 per cent for privates. By halting inductions for six months, the lower chamber deprives the Army of the wealth of better manpower obtainable through the draft. The amendment limiting service to 18 months would force the Army to release immediately some 400,000 men in uniform.

What the final outcome will be is doubtful. It seems certain that the ultimate compromise will not be what administration leaders wish.

THE POSTMAN RINGS

Toward the end of April the national theme song appeared to be, "I'm going to sit right down and write my congressman a letter." The spark for the writing public came on April 18, when the House of Representatives passed a bill theoretically extending the life of the Office of Price Adminstration. The deluge of mail was so great that many representatives and senators had to hire special assistants to handle it. Senator Taft alone received 10,000 letters in one week.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reasons for the pen-wielding were the series of amendments which the House attached to the O.P.A. bill, amendments which administration leaders claimed would make the agency worse than useless. O.P.A. Administrator Porter asserted that the House action amounted "to a repeal of price control."

These changes in the bill extended the agency's life for only nine months, guaranteed cost plus a "reasonable profit" to producers, processors, distributors and retailers of each commodity handled, and removed all food subsidies by the end of 1946, under an inflexible system where subsidies would be reduced a certain fixed amount each month. The House cut the funds for subsidies 65 per cent, and required the lifting of ceilings from a commodity within 10 days after certification by either the Department of Agriculture or the industry advisory committees that its production for a 12-month period is equal to its production in the year July, 1940, to June, 1941.

The House took the attitude that criticisms often expressed against the O.P.A. indicated public disgust with all phases of price control. But its action caused even many businessmen to stop, look and listen. While the National Association of Manufacturers argued for immediate end of the O.P.A., many businessmen wanted price control continued and bought space in the newspapers to tell the people so. Their position was that they wished controls shelved as soon as possible, but wanted them continued until sufficient production was at hand to soak up surplus money. Said Eric Johnson, retiring president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, "It would be suicidal if price control was abolished immediately." Even the zealous lobbyists began to back down after they heard the uproar of the House measure. They told the Senate Banking Committee, to which the O.P.A. extension bill was referred, that a better "middle ground" could be found.

If this session of the Senate finds time for consideration of the measure, the O.P.A. should be extended in much the fashion which the administration wishes. For whereas the entire House faces elections this fall, only one-third of the Senate is in that position. And it seems likely that the House, having put its sentiments on record, will vote for a Senate compromise measure.

APPROVAL FOR BRITISH CREDITS

After a month of debate the Senate, put its stamp of approval on one administration measure. The $3,750,000,000 credit to Great Britain, which Truman has termed the keystone of this country's foreign economic policy, was approved on May 10, by a vote of 46 to 34. The measure was then thrown to the tender mercies of the House, which has established a reputation for being much harsher with Truman's proposals than the Senate.

Opponents of the measure argued in the Senate, and will repeat in the House, that this country cannot afford to add nearly $4,000,000,000 to its debt; that the loan opens the way for indiscriminate lending to other coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries; that it underwrites either socialism in England or imperialism in the Middle East. In answer to these arguments the proponents of the measure claim that by increasing Britain's purchasing power we increase production and income in this country, that the loan helps to break down world trade barriers, since in return for the loan Britain agrees to abolish her empire preferential system, and that failure to grant the loan will force Britain to adopt a more tightly closed empire economy.

THE OLD GUARD PASSES

The United States Supreme Court had finished ruling that an alien cannot be denied citizenship because he refuses to bear arms in the nation's defense. Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone did not agree with the Court's decision, and was reading his dissenting opinion. In the middle of it he became ill, and his physician ordered him home. That evening, April 22, the man who was appointed to the court by Coolidge in 1925 and made Chief Justice by Roosevelt in 1941, died of a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

In 11 months of office Truman has had to appoint two justices to the Court. His first appointee was a Republican, Harold Burton. By the middle of May his second choice had not been made public.

At first it was believed that he would raise one of the remaining eight Associate Justices to the rank of Chief Justice. But after conferring with former Chief Justice Hughes and former Associate Justice Roberts the President apparently was convinced that only an outside Chief Justice could keep harmony on the bench. At the present moment the Court is split into two so-called "liberal" and "conservative" factions, with Black, Douglas, Murphy and Rutledge more often than not deciding to the left of Jackson, Reed, Frankfurter and Burton. Stone served as the balance wheel, and Truman's next appointee will have a similar role. Current speculation of Stone's possible successor centers around Secretary of War Patterson, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and Pennsylvania's federal judge Goodrich.

FROM TERRITORY TO NATION IN 48 YEARS

The Philippines will receive their independence on July 4, 1946. In preparation for the launching of the new ship of state, pilots in both Washington and Manila undertook to make sure that the nation was well supplied with all rations for its maiden trip.

On April 23 the Filipinos went to the polls to elect their new president, who would become the first president of the Republic. Their choice was between incumbent, elderly Sergio Osmena and Brigadier General Manuel Roxas. The former, who had been a general with MacArthur, a member of the Philippine puppet government during Japanese occupation, and President of the Senate, won an overwhelming victory.

In this country Congress appropriated $520,000,000 for the rehabilitation of the islands. The Senate also approved a 28-year program establishing mutually advantageous trade relations with the Republic of the Philippines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDEX FOR JANUARY-JUNE, 1946

Volume CV, Numbers 1-6

SUBJECTS

AUSTRIA:
Austrian Election, Jan., 442.
BOOKS IN BRIEF:
Jan., 462; Feb., 556; Mar., 652; Apr., 746; May, 842; June, 932.
EDITORLIALINGO:
What Should We Do in China? Jan., 450;
Shall Congress Control Realty Prices? Feb., 516;
Control of Our Pacific Bases, Mar., 642;
Should Congress Extend the O.P. A. Beyond June 30? Apr., 736;
The Food Crisis, May, 834;
The Coal Strike, June, 926.
EDUCATION:
Our Responsibility for German Universities, Jan., 396;
Who Is Responsible for American Illiteracy? Feb., 528;
Mexico's ABC Crusade, Mar., 605;
College Dilemma, Mar., 621;
Education for Labor, May, 775;
FORUM:
How Can We Increase Real Wages? Jan., 432;
Who Is Responsible for American Illiteracy? Feb., 528;
Is the Demobilization Program Fair? March, 624;
Should Congress Declare the War Ended? April, 720;
Should Congress Increase the Minimum Wage? May, 816.
Should Palestine Become the Jewish Homeland?, June, 912.
FRANCE:
As France Sowed . . . Jan., 446;
French Problems of Empire, Apr., 699.
GERMANY:
German Destruction or Regeneration? Jan., 385;
Our Responsibility for German Universities, Jan., 396;
The Potsdam Policies, Feb., 488;
Agricultural Dilemma in Germany, May, 792.
Bismarck's Enemy, June, 873.
GREAT BRITAIN:
Bitter Medicine, Apr., 716;
Anglo-American Alliance, May, 840;
The Same Old Story, June, 909.
HIGHLIGHTING THE NEWS:
Jan., 470; Feb., 566; Mar., 662; Apr., 756; May, 852; June, 942.
INDIA:
The 'Twain Should Meet, Apr., 718.
INFORMAL ESSAYS:
Beware—Bazaar! Jan., 429;
The Woman's Touch, Jan., 444;
Exit Behemoth, Jan., 460;
Scarred Veteran of the Screen, Feb., 540;
Heroes Anonymous, Feb., 546;
"Wee, sleekit . . . beastie", Feb., 512;
Get a Bus, Brothers, Feb., 521;
Enter—Persephone, Mar., 613;
Mrs. Feddup Screams, Mar., 615;
Blueprint—Labor Peace, Mar., 620;
Budget Items, Mar., 623;
Promotion on Kendall, Mar., 646;
The Civilian Problem, Mar., 647;
"And the Night Shall Be Filled", Mar., 649;
Halley's Threat, Apr., 710;
Picture them! Apr., 730;
The Brief Case, Apr., 744;
G-Men and G-2, May, 804;
Kendall's Formula, May, 810.
The Lost Art, June, 903;
A Raffles' Case, June, 923;
Wanted: Juke Box Teacher, June, 924;
Country Comment, June, 931;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERNATIONAL:
The Score at Moscow, Feb., 544;
Africa at the Peace Table, Mar., 600;
The First U.N.O. Assembly, Apr., 685;
World Bank in Policy-Making Sphere, May, 828.
Byrnes Scores, June, 405.
ITALY:
Aid for Italy, Feb., 523.
JAPAN:
Japanese Journey, Mar., 638.
THE MIDDLE EAST:
Dollar Diplomats in Araby? Jan., 430;
Iron Curtain on Iran, Feb., 553;
Call the Mufti! Mar., 611.
MUSIC:
The Savoyards, Feb., 505.
PHILOSOPHY:
What Is the Matter with Us? Jan., 409;
Can Democracy Be Transplanted? Jan., 414;
The State and the Family, Feb., 481;
How Are Your Illusions? Feb., 555;
The Function of Knowledge, Mar., 577;
The Function of Religion, Apr., 673;
Vulture's Paradise, Apr., 733.
POETRY:
Jan., 461; Feb., 525; Mar., 617; Apr., 715; May, 839; June, 911.
REVIEW OF BOOKS:
Adamic, Louis: *A Nation of Nations,* Jan., 464;
Adams, James Truslow: *Big Business in a Democracy,* Jan., 463;
Anthony, Norman: *How to Grow Old Disgracefully,* June, 935;
Barnes, Margaret Campbell: *My Lady of Cleves,* May, 846;
Barrett, Monte: *Tempered Blade,* June, 934;
Beard, Mary R.: *Women as Force in History,* May, 845;
Beattie, Edward W. Jr.: *Diary of a Krieger,* June, 934;
Bellah, Charles Warner: *Ward 20,* Apr., 748;
Bennett, Lowell: *Parachute to Berlin,* Jan., 465;
Blicher, Steen Steensen: *Twelve Stories,* Mar., 655;
Bodley, R. V. C.: *The Messenger,* June, 935;
Bright, Robert: *The Intruders,* June, 935;
Butcher, Harry C.: *My Three Years With Eisenhower,* June, 933;
Brunner, Emil: *Justice and the Social Order,* Mar., 653;
Cant, Gilbert: *Great Pacific Victory,* Mar., 655;
Clapper, Olive Ewing: *Washington Tapestry,* Apr., 749;
Cobb, Elisabeth: *My Wayward Parent,* Jan., 465;
Cohen, Morris R.: *The Faith of a Liberal,* Apr., 748;
Commander, Henry Steele: *The Story of the Second World War,* Mar., 655;
Considine, Robert: *General Wainwright's Story,* June, 933;
Cousins, Norman: *Modern Man Is Obsolete,* Jan., 464;
Dana, H. W. L.: *Seven Soviet Plays,* Apr., 750;
Davis, Kenneth L.: *Soldiers of Democracy,* Feb., 559;
Dick, Isabel: *Country Heart,* June, 936;
Dreiser, Theodore: *The Bulwark,* June, 936;
Du Maurier, Daphne: *The King's General,* Mar., 656;
Dupee, F. W.: *The Question of Henry James,* Feb., 560;
Ernest, Morris L.: *The First Freedom,* Apr., 746;
French, Herbert E.: *My Yankee Paris,* Mar., 655;
Ford, Corey and MacBlain Alastair: *Cloak and Dagger,* May, 846;
Gervasi, Frank: *To Whom Palestine?* May, 844;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Goodman, Nathan G.: *A Benjamin Franklin Reader,* Mar., 654;
Graham, Frank: *Al Smith, American,* Mar., 653;
Haggerty, Edward: *Guerilla Padre in Mindanao,* June, 954;
Halsey, George D.: *Supervising People,* Apr., 749;
Harlow, Alvin F.: *Steelways of New England,* Mar., 654;
Hayes, Carlton J. H.: *Wartime Mission in Spain, 1942-1945,* Feb., 559;
Howard, Elizabeth Metzger: *Befor the Sun Goes Down,* Apr., 750;
Ingersoll, Ralph: *Top Secret,* June, 932;
Jabotinsky, Vladimar: *The Story of the Jewish Legion,* May, 844;
Janowsky, Oscar I.: *Nationalities and National Minorities,* Feb., 558;
James, Selwyn: *Man of Brittany,* Apr., 750;
Johnson, Ernest F.: *World Order,* Feb., 556;
Kahn, E. J., Jr. and McLemore, Henry: *Fighting Divisions,* Mar., 654;
Korig, Walter, Commander; Burton, Earl, Lieutenant; Freeland, Stephen L., Lieutenant: *Battle Report,* May, 845;
Lasser, David: *Private Monoply,* Jan., 462;
Lewisohn, Sam A.: *Human Leadership in Industry,* Jan., 464;
Lin, Taiyi: *The Golden Coin,* June, 936;
Loewenstein, Karl: *Political Reconstruction,* May, 843;
MacIver, R. M.: *Civilization and Group Relationships,* Feb., 556;
Markey, Morris: *Well Done,* Jan., 465;
Master, Dexter and Way, Katherine: *One World or None,* May, 842;
Meyerson, M. H.: *Germany's War Crimes and Punishment,* Jan., 465;
Mellor, William Bancroft: *Patton, Fighting Man,* Apr., 749;
Miller, Arthur: *Focus,* Feb., 560;
Miller, Max: *It's Tomorrow Out Here,* Mar., 655;
Monks, John, Jr.: *A Ribbon and a Star,* Feb., 560;
Ojike, Mbonia: *My Africa,* May, 845;
Padover, Saul K.: *Experiment in Germany,* June, 934;
Pearson, Haydn S.: *Success on the Small Farm,* June, 935;
Phillips, Henry Albert: *Brazil,* Feb., 560;
Powell, Adam Clayton, Jr.: *Marching Blacks,* Mar., 653;
Pratt, Fletcher: *Night Work,* Apr., 748;
Price, Willard: *Japan and the Son of Heaven,* Feb., 559;
Remarque, Erich Maria: *Arch of Triumph,* Mar., 655;
Robeson, Eslanda Goode: *African Journey,* May, 846;
Roland, Mary: *The Single Pilgrim,* May, 846;
Schmitt, Gladys: *David the King,* Apr., 750;
Seagrave, Gordon S.: *Burma Surgeon Returns,* May, 845;
Spring, Howard: *And Another Thing,* June, 935;
Strachey, John: *Socialism Looks Forward,* Feb., 560;
Sugrue, Thomas: *Starling of the White House,* Apr., 749;
Swanson, Neil H.: *The Perilous Fight,* Feb., 559;
Tallant, Robert: *Voodoo in New Orleans,* May, 846;
Tartiere, Drue: *The House Near Paris,* Apr., 749;
Teilheit, Darwin L.: *My True Love,* Mar., 656;
Tennien, Mark: *Chungking Listening Post,* Mar., 654;
United States Coast Guard: *Sea, Surf and Hell,* Jan., 465;
Warburg, James P.: *Unwritten Treaty,* Mar., 652;
West, Keith: *Peony,* June, 936;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

White, Max: *In the Blazing Light,* May, 846;
White, William Allen: *The Autobiography of William Allen White,* May, 844;
Willard, James: *General George S. Patton,* May, 845;
Yates, Raymond F.: *Atom Smashers,* Feb., 560;
Yerby, Frank: *The Foxes of Harrow,* Apr., 750;
Yoseloff, Thomas: *A Fellow of Infinite Jest,* Feb., 559;
Zu Loewenstein, Hubertus Prince: *The Lance of Longinus,* May, 846.

SCIENCE:
'45—Year of Discovery, Feb., 549.

SOUTH AMERICA:
Dutra Wins, Feb., 552.

SOCIOLOGY:
The Shifting Balance of World Population, Jan., 419;
The State and the Family, Feb., 481;
The Shifting Balance of World Population, Feb., 493;
What Chance for Women? Mar., 590;
Religion and the Birth Rate, Mar., 595;
Mexico's ABC Crusade, Mar., 605;
A Responsible Press? Apr., 706;
Trial by Court-Martial, May, 769;
Education for Labor, May, 775;
Operation Ivory Tower, May, 786;
The Challenge of Mental Deficiency, May, 797;
A Tip to Radio, May, 811.
Divorce in Our Time, June, 865;
Is Hollywood Growing Up-I? June, 880;
New Deal for the Mentally Ill? June, 886;
Cracker Barrel Critics, June, 893.

SOVIET UNION, THE:
Russia and the Far East, Jan., 391.
The Same Old Story, June, 909.

SPAIN:
Stirrings in Spain, Mar., 650.

THEATRE ARTS, THE:
Jan., 466; Feb., 561; Mar., 657; Apr., 751; May, 847; June, 937.

UNITED STATES, THE:
ECONOMICS AND FINANCE:
Economics By Law, Jan., 403;
Will Rents Soar Again? Jan., 427;
"A Brief Message . . .", Jan., 455;
U.A.W. Strikes, Jan., 457;
Why Extend Price Controls? Feb., 547;
How Can We Increase Real Wages? Jan., 432;
R.E.A. Under Fire, Mar., 614;
'29 Again? Mar., 640;
The Wheat Bottleneck, Apr., 731;
Should Congress Increase the Minimum Wage? May, 816;
World Bank in Policy-Making Sphere, May, 828;
Long-term Housing, May, 832;
Call to Co-ops, June, 901.
FOREIGN RELATIONS:
What Should We Do in China? Jan., 450;
Let China Alone, Feb., 510;
Dollar Diplomats in Araby? Jan., 430;
Control of Our Pacific Bases, Mar., 642;
Choice in the Pacific, Apr., 741;
Agricultural Dilemma in Germany, May, 792;
The Food Crisis, May, 834;
Anglo-American Alliance, May, 840.
Byrnes Scores, June, 405.
LABOR:
Labor and the Two Party System, Feb., 499;
U.A.W. Strikes, Jan., 457;
"Smash Their Ends!" Apr., 734;
Trade Unions: Bureaucratic or Democratic? Apr., 680;
Education for Labor, May, 775.
MEDICINE:
A.M.A. Dissents, Feb., 514.

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS:
What Is the Matter with Us? Jan., 409;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The State and the Family, Feb., 481;
The Function of Knowledge, Mar., 577;
The Function of Religion, Apr., 673;
Vulture's Paradise, Apr., 733.

POLITICS:
Pressure Parodies Democracy, Jan., 443;
Labor and the Two Party System, Feb., 499;
Needed: A Joint Plan, Feb., 542;
Revise Congress, Mar., 618;
Is the Demobilization Program Fair? Mar., 624;
The Bedeviled Tribes, Apr., 712;
Party Cleavage, Apr., 743;
Puerto Rican Puzzle, May, 780;
The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project, May, 805;
What Is a Party? May, 830;
Normalcy May Bring Capitalist Downfall, May, 814.
By Default, June, 907.

SOCIOLOGY:
The South Must Decide, Feb., 526;
Can We Use Conscientious Objectors Wisely? Mar., 585;
What Chance for Women, Mar., 590;
Religion and the Birth Rate, Mar., 595;
Trial by Court-Martial, May, 775;
Operation Ivory Tower, May, 786;
The Challenge of Mental Deficiency, May, 797.
Divorce in Our Time, June, 865;
Is Hollywood Growing Up-I? June, 880;
New Deal for the Mentally Ill? June, 886;
Cracker Barrel Critics, June, 893.

AUTHORS

AULTMAN, MERWYN L.:
"Wee, sleekit . . . beastie", Feb., 512.
BAILY, NATHAN:
Economics By Law, Jan., 403.
BINGAY, MALCOLM: By Default, June, 907.
BOEKER, ALEXANDER:
Agricultural Dilemma in Germany, May, 792.
BOHN, WILLIAM:
A Tip to Radio, May, 811.
BRAUN, CHARLOTTE E.:
The Savoyards, Feb., 505.
BRIER, ROYCE:
Let China Alone, Feb., 510;
The 'Twain Should Meet, Apr., 718.
BYNNER, WITTER: Poetry, June, 911.
CHILDS, MARQUIS:
Pressure Parodies Democracy, Jan., 443;
The Wheat Bottleneck, Apr., 731.
CLAIR, LOUIS:
As France Sowed . . . , Jan., 446.
CLEARY, DAVID V.:
Trial by Court-Martial, May, 769.
COX, LOUIS A.:
Forum: Is the Demobilization Program Fair? Mar., 624.
DAVIS, KINGSLEY:
The Shifting Balance of World Population, Jan., 419;
The Shifting Balance of World Population, Feb., 493.
DEUEL, WALLACE R.:
The Bedeviled Tribes, April, 712.
DEUTSCH, ALBERT:
A.M.A. Dissents, Feb., 514.
DEXTER, LEWIS A.:
Puerto Rican Puzzle, May, 780.
DILKE, MORLEY G.:
Forum: How Can We Increase Real Wages, Jan., 732.
EBON, MARTIN:
Africa at the Peace Table, Mar., 600.
ELLIS, ELLEN D.:
What Chance for Women, Mar., 590.
FAY, SIDNEY B.:
Our Responsibility for German Universities, Jan., 396;
The First U.N.O. Assembly, Apr., 685.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FAUST, HELEN:
Forum: Who Is Responsible for American Illiteracy? Feb., 528.
FISHER, CHARLES:
Heroes Anonymous, Feb., 546.
A Raffles' Case, June, 904;
FLORINSKY, MICHAEL T.:
Russia and the Far East, Jan., 391.
FRANCIS, ROBERT:
Poetry, Feb., 525; Mar., 617; Apr., 715; May, 839.
Country Comment, June, 931.
GASSNER, JOHN:
The Theatre Arts, Jan., 466; Feb., 561; Mar., 657; Apr., 751, May, 847; June, 937.
GAYN, MARK:
Japanese Journey, Mar., 638.
GRAFTON, SAMUEL:
Why Extend Price Controls? Feb., 547.
GEORGI, AUDREY A.:
Mexico's ABC Crusade, Mar., 605.
GREENE, THEODORE M.:
What Is the Matter with Us? Jan., 409;
The State and the Family, Feb., 481;
The Function of Knowledge, Mar., 577;
The Function of Religion, Apr., 673.
HARRIS, SYDNEY J.:
Beware—Bazaar! Jan., 429;
Enter—Persephone, Mar., 613;
G-Men and G-2, May, 804.
HAYDEN, JAY G.:
Iron Curtain on Iran, Feb., 553.
HERMENS, FERDINAND A.:
The Potsdam Policies, Feb., 488.
HIRSCH, FELIX E.:
German Destruction or Regeneration, Jan., 385;
Bismarck's Enemy, June, 873.
HOLMES, JOHN:
Anecdote of Robert Frost, Jan., 461.
JACKSON, H. C. L.:
College Dilemma, Mar., 621.
JONES, RALPH:
Scarred Veteran of the Screen, Feb., 540.
KAEMPFFERT, WALDEMAR:
'45—Year of Discovery, Feb., 549.
KENDALL, RICHARD G.:
Promotion on Kendall, Mar., 646;
Kendall's Formula, May, 810.
KNAPTON, ERNEST J.:
French Problems of Empire, Apr., 699;
KNEPPER, MAX: Is Hollywood Growing Up-I? June, 880.
KROCK, ARTHUR:
The Score at Moscow, Feb., 544.
KUHN, MANFORD:
Operation Ivory Tower, May, 786.
LANDIS, PAUL H.:
Religion and the Birth Rate, Mar., 595;
Divorce in Our Time, June, 865.
LEAVELLE, ARNAUD BRUCE:
Forum: Should Congress Declare the War Ended? Apr., 720.
LEWIS, JASPER R.:
Books in Brief, Jan., 462; Feb., 556; Mar., 652; Apr., 746; May, 842.
LEVER, E. J.:
Forum: How Can We Increase Real Wages? Jan., 432.
LINDLEY, ERNEST K.:
Anglo-American Alliance, May, 840.
LINDSAY, MALVINA:
Mrs. Feddup Screams, Mar., 615.
LIPPMANN, WALTER:
Needed: a Joint Plan, Feb., 542;
Choice in the Pacific, Apr., 741.
MARTIN, HAROLD:
The Brief Case, Apr., 744.
McCORMICK, ANNE O'HARE:
Bitter Medicine, Apr., 716;
Byrnes Scores, June, 905.
McGILL, RALPH:
The South Must Decide, Feb., 526;
Normalcy May Bring Capitalist Downfall, May, 184.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McGINTY, ALICE B.:
Forum: Should Congress Increase the Minimum Wage? May, 816.
McLEMORE, HENRY:
The Civilian Problem, Mar., 647;
Wanted: Juke Box Teacher, June, 923;
McMILLIN, MILES: Call to Co-ops, June, 901.
MORTON, DAVID:
Poetry, Mar., 617; Apr., 715; June, 911.
MOWRER, EDGAR ANSEL:
Dollar Diplomats in Araby? Jan., 430;
Call the Mufti! Mar., 611;
MOWRER, PAUL SCOTT: The Same Old Story, June, 909;
MUHLEN, NORBERT: Cracker Barrel Critics, June, 893.
NOVER, BARNET:
Austrian Elections, Jan., 442.
O'BRIEN, HOWARD VINCENT:
Vulture's Paradise, Apr., 733.
OTHMAN, FREDERICK C.:
Budget Items, Mar., 623.
PARDEE, CHARLOTTE C.:
Forum: Who Is Responsible for American Illiteracy? Feb., 528.
PHILLIPS, H. I.:
Blueprint—Labor Leach, Mar., 620.
PORTER, SYLVIA F.:
Will Rents Soar Again? Jan., 427;
'29 Again? Mar., 640;
World Bank in Policy-Making Sphere, May, 828.
PREWETT, VIRGINIA:
Dutra Wins, Feb., 552.
PUSEY, MERLO:
Revise Congress, Mar., 618;
Long-Term Housing Problem, May, 832.
RACHLIS, EUGENE:
The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project, May, 805.
RIESEL, VICTOR:
"Smash Their Ends?" Apr., 734.
RITTER, ED:
The Challenge of Mental Deficiency, May, 797;
New Deal for the Mentally Ill? June, 886.
ROSE, DON:
Exit Behemoth, Jan., 460;
"And the Night Shall Be Filled" Mar., 649.
ROWELL, CHESTER:
What Is a Party? May, 830.
RUCH, WALTER W.:
U.A.W. Strikes, Jan., 457.
SERGE, VICTOR:
Stirrings in Spain, Mar., 650.
STARR, MARK:
Trade Unions: Bureaucratic or Democratic? Apr., 680;
Education for Labor, May, 775.
STOKES, THOMAS L.:
R.E.A. Under Fire, Mar., 614.
STRONG, MARY KATHERINE:
Labor and the Two-Party System, Feb., 499;
Forum: Should Congress Increase the Minimum Wage? May, 817.
THOMPSON, C. L.:
Can Democracy Be Transplanted, Jan., 414;
Should Congress Declare the War Ended? Apr., 720.
THOMPSON, E. P.:
Forum: Is the Demobilization Program Fair? Mar., 624.
TOLLES, FREDERICK B.:
Can We Use Conscientious Objectors Wisely? Mar., 585.
TOPICS OF THE TIMES:
Get a Bus, Brothers, Feb., 521;
The Lost Art, June, 703.
VILLARD, OSWALD GARRISON:
A Responsible Press? Apr., 695.
WELTY, S. F.:
Poppies in Politics, Apr., 695.
WELLES, SUMNER:
Aid for Italy, Feb., 523.
WHEELER, ROBERT L.:
Halley's Threat, Apr., 710.
WYLIE, PHILIP:
How Are Your Illusions? Feb. 555.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fifty Years of Forum

1896—depression and a presidential election. FORUM ran burning comment on Great Britain and Venezuela, the Cuban insurrection, the scars of civil war, free silver. Then as now, writers of *every political complexion* had their say in FORUM; then, as now, great issues and great men spoke from FORUM's pages.

Theodore Roosevelt launched a bitter attack on the Tammany police force; in a subsequent article he lauded the Fifty-First Congress: "a cleaner and more upright body of men . . . has rarely been seen."

American imperialist tendencies were evident. E. R. Fremantle, in an article on "Naval Aspects of the Japan-China War," cited with evident approval Bacon's statement that "no nation need expect to be great unless it makes the study of arms its principal honor and occupation."

An irate author took a sideswipe at "the continued overwrought agitation for female suffrage—another phase of fanaticism", but a more courageous doctor dared to advocate bicycling for women and the "bloomer", a wide, bifurcated garment extending from the waist to the knees, a piece of wearing apparel that by its wide proportion entirely hides the outline of the body." And Margaret E. Sangster recommended "Editorship as a Profession for Women!"

Facing the turn of the century boldly, FORUM contributors advocated improvement in public education, deplored "Criminal Crowding of Public Schools". Sunday closing of Saloons was defended and attacked; church entertainment came in for its share of criticism.

Nor were the arts neglected. While literary critics argued about Du Maurier's Trilby *and the merits of George Eliot, Anatole France described "The Chief Influences in My Career":*

"But I have drifted too long amid the delights of remembrance and I have sufficiently extolled the splendors of a life of poverty and liberty belonging to another time . . . Happy is he who can see again the image of his early youth and not experience a single sentiment of regret, of bitterness, or of disillusion . . . ."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM FEATURES

The FORUM this month covers the controversy of all controversies: namely, Palestine. We are particularly pleased to be able to present the two main viewpoints, that of the Jews vs. that of the Arabs, **by** a Jew and **by** an Arab. **Miss Marie Syrkin** defends Zionism. She is the Associate Editor of the **Jewish Frontier,** a labor publication of the Zionist movement, and, besides contributing to other periodicals, has written a book, **Your School, Your Children.** In other words, as Miss Syrkin herself says, she is an "author, educator and Zionist publicist."

Khalil Totah, executive director of the Institute of Arab Affairs, opposes Zionism. After being educated in the United States, Mr. Totah returned to his native Palestine where for six years he was in charge of teacher-training for the Palestine government. For 17 years after that he led the educational work of the American Friends in Palestine. Recently he appeared before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine. As an author he has written **Contribution of the Arabs to Education** and **History of Palestine** and was co-editor of **Palestine: A Decade of Development,** published by the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

For several years, **Norbert Muhlen,** ("Cracker Barrel Critics") has been active in the measurement and analysis of public opinion. From 1943 to 1945 he edited **The Radio Audience,** a newsletter on radio broadcasting and listening. A Ph.D. from the University of Munich, Mr. Muhlen worked as a journalist in France, Switzerland and Germany. In addition to this he has published several books, **Schacht; Hitler's Magician,** among them, and has contributed to several American magazines.

The re-publication of **FORUM** marked the return of **David Morton.** In past years he published poetry in the old **FORUM** and was a worthy part of that magazine's tradition. Mr. Morton began his literary career in 1909 as a reporter on the **Louisville Evening Post** and expanded his journalism as a correspondent for the Associated Press and then the **Louisville Courier-Journal.** Branching off into teaching, he became professor of English at Amherst in 1918. Since 1924 he has concentrated on his poetry, publishing many books of poetry and several on poetry: including **Angle of Earth and Sky, All in One Breath,** and **Spell Against Time.**

This month we are introducing two features which we shall run regularly or irregularly as space allows. The first of these is a column of rural and small town chatter designed for relaxation; "Country Comment" by the poet, **Robert Francis.** (See last month's "Forum Features.") The second is a glimpse into **FORUM'S** past and the re-printing of interesting tid-bits in "Fifty Years of Forum."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED